Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-107
Monday
4 June 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-107 *4 June 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Arms Negotiator Shelepin Cited on Vienna Talks *[Moscow Radio]* 1
Soviet, U.S. Scientists View Nuclear Test Ban *[PRAVDA 31 May]* 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Pact Commander Lushev Ends Talks in Prague *[TASS]* 2
Pact Chiefs of Staff Meet in Moscow *[TASS]* 2
Pact Commander Lushev Views State of Alliance 2
States 'No Alternative' to Pact *[Moscow Radio]* 2
Views Future Changes in Pact *[TASS]* 2
Pact Schedules Political Consultative Meeting *[PRAVDA 1 Jun]* 2
Transformation Needed for Warsaw Pact's Survival *[Moscow International]* 2
More on Zaykov Tour of Troop Units in GDR *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 May]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Reportage Concerning German Reunification 5
TASS Comments 5
Shevardnadze Interviewed on Talks *[Hamburg WELT AM SONNTAG 27 May]* 5
Gorbachev's Adviser Interviewed *[Hamburg BILD 28 May]* 6
Gorbachev Adviser Criticizes West *[DPA]* 7
Upcoming CSCE Human Rights Forum Discussed *[TASS]* 7
'Roundtable' Discusses Summit, Reunification *[Moscow Radio]* 7
NATO Concepts for European Strategy Criticized *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 31 May* 10

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Gorbachev, Mulroney Hold Joint Press Conference *[TASS]* 12
Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to U.S. 15
Gorbachev Addresses Intelligentsia *[Moscow TV]* 15
Gorbachev Speaks at Dinner 31 May *[TASS]* 18
Gorbachev, Quayle Meet at Embassy *[Moscow TV]* 19
'Improvised Press Conference' Noted *[Moscow TV]* 20
Gorbachev Speaks With Congressmen *[Moscow TV]* 21
Shevardnadze Notes 'Good' Relations *[TASS]* 31
Gorbachev Receives Peace Awards *[TASS]* 31
Gorbachev, Bush Sign Agreements *[TASS]* 31
Gorbachev Speaks at Ceremony *[Moscow Radio]* 32
Gorbachev Speaks at Dinner 1 Jun *[Moscow Radio]* 33

China

Military Delegation Holds Talks in PRC *[Moscow International]* 35
Khuzhokov Interviewed on Visit *[Moscow International]* 35
PRC Military Official Meets With Belousov *[Moscow International]* 35
Ministry Official Discusses Trade With PRC *[Moscow International]* 36
Pugo-Led Delegation Continues PRC Visit 36

Sees Qiao Shi in Beijing *[PRAVDA 31 May]* 36
Pugo Discusses Visit *[Moscow TV]* 37
Pugo Reviews Visit, Departs *[Moscow International]* 37

Northeast Asia

KCNA Cited on Consequences of ROK Summit *[Moscow International]* 37
Seoul Cited on No Tae-u-Gorbachev Meeting *[Moscow International]* 37
DPRK Proposes Disarmament for Peace in Korea *[Moscow International]* 38
'New Climate' Seen in No Tae-u Visit to Japan *[Dmitriyev on Moscow International]* 38
Japanese Plan for Tanks on Hokkaido Deplored *[Vinogradov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 May]* . 39
Officals Cite Japan's 'Malicious Poaching' *[Tokyo KYODO]* 39
Seized Boats Taken to Shikotan *[Tokyo KYODO]* 39
Spokesman Notes 'Constant Violation' *[Moscow International]* 40
Biryukova Attends Osaka Flower Exposition *[Moscow International]* 40
Speaks at Osaka Ceremony *[Moscow TV]* 40
PRAVDA's Frolov Meets With ASAHI Chiefs *[PRAVDA 22 May]* 41

Southeast Asia & Pacific

U.S. Should Follow Soviet Lead in Closing Bases *[Moscow International]* 41
Ties With Philippines Reviewed on Anniversary *[Aleksandrov on Moscow International]* 42
'Encouraging' Election Results Noted in Burma *[Vladimirov on Moscow International]* 42

Near East & South Asia

'Arafat Praise for Soviet Summit Stance Noted *[TASS]* 43
Improved U.S. Ties Affect Middle East Policy *[Zgerskiy on Moscow International]* 43
End to Violence, Extremism in Middle East Urged *[Moscow Radio Peace and Progress]* 44
Peres Remarks to Socialist International Cited *[IZVESTIYA 26 May]* 44
Foreign Ministry on Pakistani Intelligence Actions *[TASS]* 45
Indian Kashmir Initiative Reported *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* 45

East Europe

Vorobyev Comments on Troop Pullout From CSFR 45
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Interview *[31 May]* 45
IZVESTIYA Interview *[1 Jun]* 47
CSFR's Havel Writes to Gorbachev, Bush *[TASS]* 48
Hungary Rejects Pact, Wants 'Correct' Ties *[PRAVDA 1 Jun]* 49
'Intourist' Cancels USSR Trips to GDR *[TASS]* 49
Soviet Troop Withdrawal From Poland Begins *[Moscow TV]* 49
PAP Cited on Attack on Gdansk Consulate *[Moscow Radio]* 49

West Europe

British Premier's Visit to USSR Previewed *[PRAVDA 4 Jun]* 49
Declaration Signed With UK on Science Links *[PRAVDA 29 May]* 51
Yazov Visits Italy, Views Disarmament *[Milan L'UNITA 25 May]* 51
Bundeswehr Tour Part of Quest for Neighborliness *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 May]* 52
Naval Squadron To Call at FRG Port *[TASS]* 52
FRG Official Proposes USSR Join NATO *[TASS]* 52
Austria's Laenderbank Opens Office in Moscow *[IZVESTIYA 28 May]* 52
Protocols on Military Conversion Signed in Vienna *[TASS]* 53
U.S. Bases Agreement With Greece Detailed *[PRAVDA 31 May]* 53
Sweden Vote Against Recognizing Lithuania Noted *[SOVETSKAY ROSSIYA 1 Jun]* 54
Shevardnadze Arrives in Denmark *[TASS]* 54

Latin America & Caribbean

Foreign Ministry Views Contra Demobilization *[TASS]* 54

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Reportage on 4 Jun Supreme Soviet Session 55
Third Session Reopens *[TASS]* 55
Gorbachev Greetings Conveyed *[Moscow Radio]* 55
Lukyanov Opens Session *[Moscow Radio]* 55
Moscow TV Carries 1 Jun Supreme Soviet Session 56
Vasiliev Stresses Law Would Bring 'Independence' *[TASS]* 56
Yazov Expresses Apologies for Afghan War *[TASS]* 57

Political & Social

Yeltsin-Gorbachev Compromise Viewed as Possible *[Rome AVANTI! 30 May]* 57
Yakovlev Views Democracy, Economic Freedom *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jun]* 58
Yakovlev Sees Market Economy as 'Breakthrough' *[Moscow International]* 61
Press Given Information for Covering Congress *[TASS]* 61
More Delegates Elected for 28th CPSU Congress *[PRAVDA 31 May]* 61
Government Moves Toward Closing Chernobyl *[PRAVDA 1 Jun]* 62
Gorbachev Greets First Leaseholders' Congress *[TASS]* 62
Yazov Addresses Mothers of Afghan War Dead *[Moscow TV]* 62
Moscow TV Reports on Problems in Republics 63
CPSU Democratic Platform Supporters Meet *[TASS]* 63
TASS Director Ponders Media Changes *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 5 May]* 63
Interior Ministry on Drive Against Drugs *[Moscow Radio]* 66
Plans for New Satellite Communications System *[Moscow TV]* 66

Economic

Fire Breaks Out at Vorkuta Mine 27 May *[Moscow International]* 67
Extraction Resumes *[TASS]* 67
Chemical Plant Converts to Civilian Use *[Moscow International]* 67
Natural Gas Deposit Found in Barents Sea *[Moscow Radio]* 67
Abalkin Notes 'Realism' of Reform Program *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 26 May]* 67
Orlov Interviewed on Aims of USSR Reforms *[Rome ANSA]* 70
New Business Weekly To Debut in June *[IZVESTIYA 28 May]* 70

Scientific

'Mir' Orbiter, 'Kristall' Module Flights Continue *[TASS]* 70
Cosmonauts Conduct Physical Training Experiments *[Moscow Radio]* 71
New Communications System Presented in Moscow *[Moscow TV]* 71
Space Technology Utilized in Industry *[TASS]* 71
First Ever AIDS Conference Held in Leningrad *[Moscow Radio]* 72

Military

Yazov Delivers Speech at Far East Conference *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Jun]* 72
Yazov Article Reviews Tasks of Military Reform *[TASS]* 73
Turkestan Military Conference Notes Shortcomings *[Tashkent Radio]* 74
Role of Military Trade Services Assessed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 May]* 74
Letter to OGONEK Editor Korotich Published *[VETERAN No 22]* 76

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Polish Petrol for Lithuania Stopped at Border *[AFP]* 79
Lithuanian Commission Meets, Views Power Issues *[Vilnius Radio]* 79
More on Energy Situation *[Vilnius Radio]* 79

Fuel Shortages Cause Closure of Enterprises *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
Landsbergis Criticizes Gorbachev Remarks *[Vilnius International]* 80
Report on Landsbergis CSFR News Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 80
New 'Soviet Lithuania' Radio Station Reported *[Vilnius International]* 80
Party Views New Station *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
Lithuanian Councils Discuss Vilnius Problems *[TASS]* 81
Report on Council Farm Loan, Pension Decrees *[Vilnius Domestic]* 81
Lithuanian Resolution Seen as 'Sidestep' *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 25 May]* 81
Prunskiene on Talk With Gorbachev, Ryzhkov *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 21]* 82
Prunskiene Sends Letters to U.S. Leaders *[Vilnius International]* 83
Commentary on Prospects for Lithuanian Talks *[Moscow International]* 83
Loyalist Lithuanian Party Congress Resumes *[Moscow International]* 84
Adopts Resolutions *[TASS]* 84
Estonian Deputies Seek International Commission *[TASS]* 85
TASS Assesses Estonian Parliament's Decisions 85
End of Estonian Parliament Session Reported *[Moscow TV]* 86
Estonian Resolution on State Status Published *[SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA 1 Apr]* 86
Riga Authorities Introduce Food Rationing *[TASS]* 86
Latvian Parties Attend First Roundtable *[TASS]* 87
Baltic Role in 'Two-Plus-Four' Talks Proposed *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 27 May]* 87
Baltic Leaders Urge Coordinated Action *[Vilnius Radio]* 87
Baltic, Soviet Officials Discuss Power Situation *[Vilnius International]* 88

RSFSR

RSFSR Congress Discusses Deputy Chairmanships *[TASS]* 88
Moscow TV Relays 1 June Congress Proceedings 88
Isayev Elected Deputy Chairman 88
Goryacheva Speaks 89
Sovereignty Declaration Debated 89
Armenian Request Read 90
Yeltsin on Party Membership 91
Estonian Leader Speaks 91
Special Congress Proposed 92
Estonian Leader Addresses Congress *[Moscow TV]* 92
TASS Roundup of 1 June Congress Session 93
Article Views Congress Sovereignty Debate *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 May]* 93
RSFSR Health Minister on Costs, Changes *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 21]* 95
Russian Trade Union Body on 'Market' Referendum *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 31 May]* 96
Moscow Democratic Platform Conference Held *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 29 May]* 97
Moscow City Soviet Decisions on Assets Reported *[IZVESTIYA 31 May]* 97
Moscow Plenum Views Upcoming CPSU Congress *[PRAVDA 31 May]* 97
Report on Continuing Panic-Buying in Leningrad *[Leningrad Maritime Press]* 98
Leningrad Communists Urge Referendum on Party *[Moscow Radio]* 98
Sobchak Elected Leningrad Mayor *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA No 21]* 98
Outlines Program *[IZVESTIYA 25 May]* 99
Altay Kray Gasoline Supplies Decreasing *[Moscow Radio]* 99
Report on Popular Orthodox Movement Briefing *[MOSCOW NEWS No 18]* 100
Novocherkassak Memorial Held for Rally Victims *[Moscow TV]* 100
Komi ASSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Elected *[Moscow Radio]* 101
Smolensk Oblast Party Committee Chairman Elected *[Moscow Radio]* 101
First Secretary Reassigned *[PRAVDA 30 May]* 101
Galazov Reelected in North Ossetian ASSR *[Moscow Radio]* 101
New Tyumen Oblast, City Leadership Elected *[IZVESTIYA 16 May]* 101
Svekolkin Reelected Magadan Oblast Secretary *[PRAVDA 1 Jun]* 102
Buryat Party Organization Conference Held *[Moscow Radio]* 102
Astrakhan Party Conference Held; Dyakov Reelected *[Moscow Radio]* 102
Four Oblasts Replace Party First Secretaries *[Moscow TV]* 102

Western Republics

Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Debates Chairmanship *[PRAVDA 2 Jun]* 102
Candidate for Chairmanship Interviewed *[Kiev International]* 103
Chairman Candidates View Leadership Roles *[Kiev International]* 103
Report on Nominations for Chairmanship *[Kiev International]* 104
Ukraine's Ivashko Remarks on Elections *[Kiev International]* 104
Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Deputies on Session *[Kiev International]* 104
Ukrainian Deputy Criticizes Moscow, Party *[Kiev International]* 105
Report on Compromises in Ukrainian Parliament *[IZVESTIYA 23 May]* 105
Ukraine Adopts Resolution on Economic Plan *[TASS]* 105
Views Market Transition *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 31 May]* 105
Report on Ukrainian Suprme Soviet Proceedings *[PRAVDA 23 May]* 106
Ukrainian Leader Urges Caution on Market Economy *[Moscow TV]* 106
Report on Ivashko Tour of Dnepropetrovsk *[PRAVDA UKRAINY 8 May]* 106
Ukrainian Farmers Demand Recall of Deputies *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 12 May]* 107
Ukrainian Democratic Party Issues Manifesto *[Kiev International]* 107
Belorussian Supreme Soviet Views Market Reform *[Moscow Radio]* 107
Moldvia Requests Return of Armenian Aid *[Moscow TV]* 108

Caucasus

Armenia's Movsisyan Claims 'Crisis of Power' *[IZVESTIYA 1 Jun]* 108
Official Comments on 'Tense Situation' in Yerevan *[TASS]* 108
Union Official Interviewed on Yerevan Situation *[Moscow Radio]* 109
Union Deputy Discusses Armenian Incidents *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 1 Jun]* 109
Moscow TV Reports Situation in Yerevan 'Calm' 110
Armenian Central Committee on 27 May Incident *[TASS]* 111
'Apathy' Forces Repeat Elections in Armenia *[Moscow Radio]* 111
Armenian Deputy Says Freedom Fight To Continue *[Moscow TV]* 111
Raiders in Armenia Attempt To Seize Tanks *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 May]* 111
Relative Peace 'Disrupted' in NKAO *[Baku Radio]* 112
Report on Azerbaijan Party Plenum Proceedings *[Baku Radio]* 112
'Georgian Citizens' League Mission Noted *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 May]* 113
Georgia's Political Situation Examined *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 23 May]* 113
Georgian Union of Free Democrats Formed *[MOLODEZH GRUZII 27 Apr]* 114

Central Asia

Turkmen Supreme Soviet Amends Constitution *[IZVESTIYA 28 May]* 115
Debates Party Role, Presidency *[Moscow Radio]* 116
Tajik Issues Decree on Food, Consumer Goods *[Moscow Radio]* 116
Kazakh Central Committee Plenum Reported *[PRAVDA 30 May]* 116
Election Officials Found Guilty of Forgery *[Moscow Radio]* 116
Committee on Germans Hears Kazakh Report *[TASS]* 116
Kazakh Social Democrats Discuss Platform *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 117
Report on Debates at Karaganda Miners Meeting *[IZVESTIYA 24 May]* 117
Karaganda Miners Welcome New Trade Union Role *[Moscow TV]* 117
Lichtenstein Firm Opens Mission in Alma-Ata *[TASS]* 118
Name Change for Alma-Ata Square Reported *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 118

Arms Negotiator Shelepin Cited on Vienna Talks

LD0106150290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] Talks on measures for strengthening confidence and security are continuing in Vienna. Here is what our Vienna correspondent Viktor Mikheyev says about it.

[Mikheyev] There have been heated debates at the Vienna talks on measures for strengthening confidence and security. But they are marked out for their constructiveness. What is the most important feature and how can their progress be described at present? Envoy Mikhail Petrovich Shelepin, member of the Soviet delegation, answers this question.

[Begin Shelepin recording] I would describe the state of affairs at these talks with a certain optimism. The most important thing, in my view, is that now practically all the participants in these talks—in other words, 33 European states, the United States, and Canada—agree that the all-European summit, which is to take place this fall, must draw up a weighty and substantial document on measures for strengthening confidence and security in Europe. And I must say that of late, some states have put forward very interesting proposals. For example, the Swedish delegation put forward a proposal on exchanging information about programs and plans for developing armed forces in the zone where confidence measures are to be applied. From our point of view, it seems that the idea incorporated into the foundation of the Swedish proposal is in harmony with our approach to this problem, too.

Finally, we support Hungary's new proposal on holding annual meetings for analyzing the implementation of the accords on measures of confidence and security. So, our position is very constructive. We strive for consensus [soglasiye] wherever possible. And we proceed from the need to develop, for the forthcoming European summit, a sound document containing substantial measures of confidence and security which, naturally, would cover military activity on land, in the air, and at sea and would stipulate its considerable limitation. [end recording]

Soviet, U.S. Scientists View Nuclear Test Ban

PM0106094990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 90 First Edition p 7

[Report by V. Kikilo: "When Will Nuclear Explosions Cease? Dialogue Between Soviet and U.S. Nuclear Scientists"]

[Text] "Does anyone here object to the immediate conclusion of a treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear weapon tests?" The audience fell silent when Thomas Cochran, head of the Natural Resources Defense Council, asked this question. But it would not be entirely right to take this reaction to mean complete approval. Indeed, a very broad spectrum of people had assembled there, in a Moscow hotel, on the initiative of the International Foundation for the Survival and Development of Mankind.

There were specialists from major U.S. nuclear research centers (the laboratories in Los Alamos and Princeton and the Livermore radiation laboratory), scientists from the Kurchatov Atomic Energy Institute, representatives of the USSR Defense Ministry, and independent technical experts from the United States and Britain.

In fact, they met not necessarily to elaborate a common viewpoint on the problem of ending nuclear tests. The meeting participants' task was to consider potential scenarios on ways to move toward this goal, with the emphasis on the technical aspects. Then their recommendations would be incorporated in the foundation's report, which would be submitted to the supreme legislative organs of the USSR and the United States and also to the United Nations. The working title of the report is "On the Way to a General and Complete Ban on Nuclear Tests."

"In my view, there are two sides to the nuclear test ban problem: political and technical," Professor Frank von Hippel of Princeton University, American cochairman of the meeting said. "In the political sphere a nuclear test ban is important in terms of preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and stopping the development of new, destabilizing types of nuclear weapons—so-called third-generation weapons," he said. In his view, these two tasks are more important than the concern about the "reliability" of nuclear devices voiced by representatives of U.S. laboratories creating nuclear weapons. According to them, it would be jeopardized if tests were halted. As is known, this argument among others is used by the U.S. Government to justify its reluctance to agree to halt underground nuclear explosions immediately, which is what the Soviet Union has proposed.

One should not expect the United States to halt nuclear weapon tests tomorrow. This will have to be fought for, the U.S. scientist said. Therefore the task of actually halting underground nuclear explosions by 1995 is reasonable and attainable, in his view. Then, Von Hippel points out, it will be a quarter of a century since the nuclear nonproliferation treaty came into force. According to the treaty, its participants are to decide, 25 years after signing it, whether to extend the agreement and on what terms. One of the conditions of nonnuclear powers' adherence to the treaty was, as is known, the pledge by the United States, the USSR, and Britain to conclude an agreement on the total cessation of nuclear tests.

In 1995, F. von Hippel said, the nonnuclear powers may well complain that that they have fulfilled their obligations under the treaty, but the United States, the USSR, and Britain have not.

Pact Commander Lushev Ends Talks in Prague

LD3005195290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1926 GMT 30 May 90

[Text] Prague, 31 May [date as received] (TASS)—Petr Lushev, commander of the United Armed Forces (UAF) of the Warsaw Pact member states, held talks in Prague today with M. Vacek, minister of national defense of the CSFR, and the Command of the Czechoslovak Army.

The talks touched on questions of the coordination of the independent armies of the countries of the Warsaw Pact.

Pact Chiefs of Staff Meet in Moscow

LD0206153490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1245 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 2 June. (TASS)—1 and 2 June there was a conference in Moscow of chiefs of general staffs with the participation of representatives of the foreign ministries of Warsaw Pact member states. It considered questions connected with the progress of the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces and measures to strengthen trust and security in Europe.

The participants in the conference confirmed the adherence of their countries to the successful conclusion of the Vienna talks in 1990. There was an exchange of views on the main positions of the negotiating process. The conference took place in a constructive and amicable atmosphere.

Pact Commander Lushev Views State of Alliance

States 'No Alternative' to Pact

LD1405114190 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 14 May 90

[Text] Today is the 35th anniversary of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. The supreme commander of the Joint Armed Forces of the Alliance, General Petr Lushev, said that all these years the member countries conducted a coordinated peaceful policy in the fields of defense and security. The general described as groundless the assertions made in the West about the so-called decline of the alliance and even its collapse. He said that at present there is no alternative mechanism in Eastern Europe which could be more effective than the Warsaw Pact in helping ensure stability on the continent and this, he said, should be understood by everyone who is interested in building a European home which would, in the long run, lead to dissolving both NATO and the Warsaw Pact, said General Lushev.

Views Future Changes in Pact

LD1805094590 Moscow TASS in English 09389 GMT 18 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow May 18 TASS—"Renewal in Warsaw Treaty member-countries has acquainted a new scale and dynamics, taking place under conditions of complete freedom of choice, with each nation deciding its own ways and methods to build a new society," Commander in Chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces, General Petr Lushev told TASS.

He was speaking after the Warsaw Pact Military Council finished work here.

Lushev said that the Soviet Union was sympathetic to the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary and Czechoslovakia and is now striving to ensure a balanced and constructive approach to German unification.

"We should synchronize German unification with the formation of new European-scale structures of security and cooperation," Lushev said. He added that this called for the guaranteed inviolability of post-war borders. According to the general, the allied countries are united in their belief that until new security structures are established the Warsaw Treaty will remain an important factor of peace and stability in Europe. It is natural, the general believes, that radical changes in our countries, Europe and the world call for corresponding changes in Warsaw Pact activity, in the system of relations within the alliance.

Joint efforts are designed to give political ways of solving problems priority over military ones in order to change a military-political alliance into a political-military one. Similar transformation is expected of NATO.

According to the general, when the future collective security system becomes a reality in Europe, the need to maintain two alliances confronting each other will disappear. But the path towards this goal is far from simple. "It presupposes radical qualitative changes in NATO, the Warsaw Pact and in relations between them," General Lushev said.

Pact Schedules Political Consultative Meeting

PM3105170790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "On Conference of Warsaw Pact States' Political Consultative Committee"]

[Text] In conformity with the agreement reached, the next conference of the Warsaw Pact States' Political Consultative Committee will be held in Moscow on 7 June 1990.

Transformation Needed for Warsaw Pact's Survival

LD1805101790 Moscow International Service in Hungarian 1900 GMT 17 May 90

[Text] [Announcer] Our commentator speaks about the problems of the Warsaw Treaty.

[Unidentified newsreader] As it is known, the Hungarian parliament has rejected a discussion of the problem of withdrawing from the Warsaw Treaty. More correctly, it will return to the question in one month's time, after it

has been prepared by the parliamentary committees. However, in principle the centrifugal forces are gaining strength, and not only in Hungary. We do not need great soothsaying abilities to say that nor is there much [time] left for the GDR, as a member of the alliance. With the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from the East European countries, the military organization of the Warsaw Treaty in many aspects is losing its meaning in the current form. However, for every member country the issue of national security is not coming off the agenda. When will the common European home be built? When will a collective security system come into existence? Until then, the problem will be topical.

If, however, let us say, Hungary were to withdraw from the Warsaw Treaty and it were to proclaim its neutrality, then, according to Gyula Horn, this neutrality would have to be guaranteed internationally, and reliable guarantees supported by real forces are necessary.

The Moscow weekly NOVOYE VREMYA writes that during this period of transition, the Warsaw Treaty could transform into a set of bilateral agreements concluded with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union would undertake -et obligations. Inter alia, it would guarantee Hungary's neutrality and the inviolability of Poland's Western borders. For this same period of transition, the Soviet Union's nuclear force could guarantee all this. It is possible, writes NOVOYE VREMYA, the mutually repelling forces appear to be dominant in the Warsaw Treaty. However, the dialectics of political balance are such that the progress toward Germany's unification gives rise to a situation in the East European countries where the alliance must be maintained with the Soviet Union. Yet this does not mean its structural freezing.

The appeal by Czechoslovak Defense Minister Miroslav Vacek on the occasion the Warsaw Treaty's 35th anniversary, says the alliance must be transformed into a political alliance, and its role in the sphere of disarmament must be stepped up. For our part, continues our commentator, we do not conceal that we have an interest in the development of alliance relations with our neighbors. Yes, with the easing of European confrontation, the military basis of the partnership of the allies is unavoidably weakened. The ideological unity in appearance of the Warsaw Treaty's member countries has disappeared into the past, and it is all the more important to shift the emphasis onto political cooperation, which is also determined by a community of regional interests and a similarity of democratic renewal processes.

Therefore, the Warsaw Treaty either has to transform rapidly in accordance with the new political thinking and new realities, or it is to be feared that it will not be able to celebrate its next anniversary.

More on Zaykov Tour of Troop Units in GDR

PM1005115790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 May 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Meetings With Troops"]

[Text] Berlin, 7 May—It is 45 years since the last salvoes of the war—the most brutal in man's history—boomed out here, in the very heart of Europe. A Soviet soldier in ravaged Berlin put the final touch to the peoples' verdict on fascism.

The victors' sons and grandsons—the troops of the Western Group of Forces, whose existence dates from our victory—now serve on this territory. They worthily continue the combat traditions and reliably guard the homeland out beyond the border guard posts.

The events of the last few months have considerably changed relations among European countries and peoples. German unification processes are developing. But an atmosphere of calm and confidence prevails within the group of Soviet forces and normal combat training is in progress. Soviet soldiers always have one task, one mission—to loyally serve the fatherland, the people, and the cause of peace.

This has been discussed in a frank and soldierly manner at numerous large meetings held by L.N. Zaykov—member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee—with personnel of the group of forces, workers, employees, and members of servicemen's families during his 3-6 May tour of garrisons, units, testing grounds, and a tank battalion's live-fire tactical exercise.

During the meetings they discussed questions linked with enhancing troops' combat training, daily routine, and living conditions along with their social security. The progress of perestroyka within the USSR Armed Forces was discussed along with the increased role of military councils, commanders, political personnel, and all Army communists in resolving the tasks of boosting troops' combat readiness and strengthening discipline.

At one of the soldiers' political study groups, L.N. Zaykov described the current situation and answered questions from his audience. He met enlisted men and NCO's at one Berlin Garrison unit club.

There was a meeting at group headquarters with the Military Council. Army General B.V. Snetkov, commander in chief of the Western Group of Forces, delivered a report on the military-political situation in the region and the results of the winter period of troop

training, noting that the level of troops' operational-tactical training, arms, and technical equipment reliably ensures their fulfillment of all their tasks.

L.N. Zaykov addressed a party conference at one of the group's formations. He gave a detailed description of party domestic and foreign policy at the present stage of perestroyka, particularly singling out the tasks of preparing for the 28th CPSU Congress that stem from the CPSU Central Committee Platform. The conference delegates stressed that all Army communists wholly and completely share the ideas voiced in the party Central Committee Open Letter.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary visited the scenes of engagements in the Berlin operation, the memorial museum dedicated to fascist Germany's surrender in Berlin's Karlshorst district, and the combat glory museums and rooms that have been set up in all formations and units.

L.N. Zaykov was accompanied in the Western Group of Forces by Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

Reportage Concerning German Reunification

TASS Comments

LD2605124190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1552 GMT 25 May 90

[By TASS political observer Aleksandr Antsiferov]

[Text] Moscow, 25 May (TASS)—It has been learned from reliable diplomatic sources that the disagreements between Moscow and Washington on the question of German reunification, which, among other issues, will be discussed during the Soviet president's visit to the United States, amount to two main points.

First, Germany's membership of NATO, to which the Soviet Union objects and on which the United States and its allies insist; and second, the setting of certain limits to the numerical strength and armaments of the Bundeswehr, which Moscow is demanding as a guarantee but which Washington rejects as it considers that any discriminatory limits could in the future become a destabilizing factor, as indeed happened in Germany itself after Versailles.

Each of the arguments of the U.S. side taken separately could, if one liked, be taken as fairly convincing. Yet together, they turn out upon examination to exclude each other in a paradoxical way.

Indeed, if one recognizes membership of a united Germany in NATO—and this is just what the West is insisting on—as the best and most reliable guarantee of stable peace on the continent, then one asks why that guarantee ceases to operate in the event of a number of limits being imposed on the Germany Army. For if the West, fearing destabilization, is disinclined to trust a united Germany just as unconditionally, then what are the NATO guarantees worth?

For these questions follows another, more general one which can explain the Soviet stand on the German problem. Has anyone the right to expect of the USSR greater trust both in NATO's plans to include Germany, and in Germany itself, when drawn into NATO, then the trust which the allies in the North Atlantic bloc themselves demonstrate?

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Talks

AU2805163290 Hamburg WELT AM SONTAG in German 27 May 90 p 4

[Interview with USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze by Vladimir Markov, diplomatic correspondent of the NOVOSTI press agency, for WELT AM SONNTAG, during the flight to Moscow after the meeting between Shevardnadze and FRG Foreign Minister Genscher in Geneva on 23 May: "Securing Peace in Europe From Berlin"]

[Text] [Markov] The Bonn "two-plus-four" talks have led to an intensification of diplomatic efforts to settle the external aspects of German unification. How important are the results of your meeting with FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher in Moscow in this connection?

[Shevardnadze] The meeting with Mr. Genscher served the joint search for a mutually acceptable agreement in all questions, which are determined by the foreign policy preconditions for the establishment of a new, united Germany. There were no extraordinary circumstances which called for this meeting. We have long agreed that it will be useful to hold extra meetings independent of those which take place within the framework of various international forums. This is to be done to discuss the European situation, external aspects of the shaping of German unity, and bilateral relations in a calm and comprehensive way.

We hold intensive consultations on these questions with all participants in the agreement of Ottawa on the establishment of the "two-plus-four" mechanism. Talks on this topic with Presidents Bush and Mitterrand and Premiers Thatcher and Mulroney are forthcoming. Naturally, we keep continuous contact with the GDR Government.

Today it is very important to set priorities and to agree on what the landscape of the future Europe is to look like in the next 10, 20, or 30 years.

[Markov] How is the "two-plus-four" mechanism to continue to work, taking into consideration external and internal aspects of the process of German unification?

[Shevardnadze] The Soviet side is for business-like, concrete, and dynamic negotiations within the framework of the "Six." The faster an agreement is achieved, the more calmly and more harmoniously can the domestic German aspects of unification be solved.

If an agreement on all questions of the external aspects of unification is achieved before the European summit, there is the opportunity to present this agreement to all 35 participants in the CSCE process. I think it is worth striving for this.

Such an agreement will provide the confidence that the foreign policy aspects of German unification will be settled in such a way that it is acceptable to all. Whether such an agreement is achieved by one or two German governments—this will not be a question of priority importance.

In our view, such a course of events would correspond to the utmost degree to the interest of all and, in particular, to the interests of the Germans themselves, because it would offer them greater leeway in solving their domestic affairs.

Of course, the achievement of the agreement of the "Six" will certainly take a certain time. Questions, such as the settlement of contractual obligations of the GDR and the FRG under the new conditions, reductions of troops, rescission of the occupation order in West Berlin, and many others, cannot be solved between today and

tomorrow for purely objective reasons. A transitional period is necessary which is to be set down exactly in terms of time. At the end of this transitional period, the rights and responsibility of the four powers should be rescinded. This would crown the entire process, which was introduced by establishing the "two-plus-four" mechanism, in a natural way.

[Markov] Which problem do you currently consider as particularly complicated regarding German unification?

[Shevardnadze] For the time being, this is the question of the military-political status of the future Germany. The Soviet Union cannot agree with the integration of the future united Germany in NATO. This attitude is determined by the reality of our foreign policy interests, our history, and our public opinion.

I think that the West must understand this and that in this question we are also aware of our responsibility to our people. Therefore, one has to look for solutions that would be acceptable both to us and to our Western partners. Intensive consultations are aimed at this, which we will continue to have with all participants of the "Six."

A decisive focal issue is the fact of outlining the future Soviet-German relations today by means of consultations with the leadership of the GDR and the FRG. This dialogue is of enormous importance for the development of stable and fruitful relations in a united Germany and for all of Europe.

[Markov] How about the comparison between the German and Soviet positions in view of the establishment of new security structures and all-European institutions of cooperation within the framework of the Helsinki process? How do you assess the results of the bilateral discussions of the topic of the Vienna negotiations?

[Shevardnadze] We concur that the dynamism of the European political life dictates the necessity to accelerate the movement on this path. I would say that our attitudes here are in harmony with each other in many respects or go in the same direction. The establishment of an all-European home, as we say, and the establishment of a new European order, as our partners from the FRG tend to say, must take place through joint efforts of all 35 participants in the CSCE. Every country will make its contribution to this.

Soviet ideas concerning potential all-European institutions proceed from the premise that nothing needs to be destroyed in the current European realities. They are based on emerging real practice in many respects. We are, for instance, of the opinion that it is important to institutionalize the summits and to turn them into a council of Greater Europe which would be convened at least once a year.

Another political level could be a committee of the foreign ministers of the 35 states. This committee could hold two sessions per year. For these two political levels, one could form a "leading three," a control body with three members which would consist of one former, one current, and one future chairman of the above-mentioned forums which have to discuss pressing topical questions.

The Soviet side is in favor of establishing an all-European center to prevent and settle conflicts which might have its seat in Berlin. This center could consist of two committees—one military and one political. We think that already during the preparation for the upcoming all-European summit, questions can be coordinated which are connected with the establishment of this center. And at the meeting, one could adopt a decision on its founding. This center could be a first decisive step concerning the establishment of new all-European structures.

In connection with the European matters,as well as in the context of the process of German unification at the consultations with the Bonn government, the situation at the Vienna negotiations on the reduction of conventional weapons and on confidence-building measures is also discussed. Both sides consider it important to accelerate the working out of agreements at the negotiations of the 35 and of the 23 in Vienna. The Soviet Union and the FRG intend to actively cooperate in this question in order to contribute to the soonest possible conclusion of the first agreement on the reduction of conventional weapons and troops in Europe.

Gorbachev's Adviser Interviewed

AU2805093890 Hamburg BILD in German 28 May 90 pp 1, 4

[Interview with Gorbachev's adviser on Germany Vyacheslav Dashichev by Irmgard Nille; date and place not given: "Reunification Possible as Soon as in December"]

[Text] [Nille] When can reunification take place?

[Dashichev] As soon as all-German elections have taken place, reunification has been completed. This may happen as soon as in December or at the beginning of next year.

[Nille] West German politicians say that unity must come quickly because Gorbachev is swaying.

[Dashichev] Gorbachev has problems. However, the processes of democratization are irreversible.

[Nille] Can a united Germany remain in NATO?

[Dashichev] I think that the integration of a united Germany in NATO does not pose any danger to us. I think very little of neutrality on the part of Germany. However, for this compromises by both sides are necessary: a reduction of the Bundeswehr, withdrawal of foreign troops from Germany, no nuclear weapons on German territory.

[Nille] What does the Soviet Union offer?

[Dashichev] Of course, the Warsaw Pact must also be transformed into some sort of political assembly.

[Nille] Will other East European countries soon withdraw from the Warsaw Pact?

[Dashichev] We even encourage it if, after decades of isolation, these countries now have the urge to orient themselves toward the West.

[Nille] How long will there still be Soviet troops in the GDR?

[Dashichev] The withdrawal is necessary but not possible immediately. The soldiers cannot be withdrawn all at once. For this we are lacking housing and jobs in the Soviet Union.

[Nille] How do you assess the introduction of the market economy in the Soviet Union?

[Dashichev] This is the only way out of the dead end into which the Stalinist system steered us. We must create the political, financial, and legal conditions so that foreign companies come to the Soviet Union.

Gorbachev Adviser Criticizes West

LD0206124290 Hamburg DPA in German 1157 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—The West is lacking in political imagination in the discussion about the place of a future united Germany in the alliance system. This view was put forward by Vadim Zagladin, personal advisor to the Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, in an interview in BILD AM SONNTAG.

The Soviet Union had proposed many variants at the Washington summit between U.S. President George Bush and Gorbachev which had not, however, been met with understanding by the West. "It [the West] insists on a united Germany remaining in an unchanged NATO," criticized Zagladin in the interview. This will merely lead to new difficulties.

However, Zagladin conceded that the two sides now better understand the position and concerns of the other. In this respect a step on the path of progress has been taken, he said.

An edited version of the interview was prereleased to DPA.

Upcoming CSCE Human Rights Forum Discussed

LD0406092890 Moscow TASS in English 0912 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow, June 4 (TASS)—"The Soviet side is prepared to discuss the proposal to create a common legal structure in Europe, to expand parliamentary and consular relations, as well as many other questions at the second session of the CSCE conference on human dimension to open in Copenhagen on Tuesday," leader of the Soviet delegation Yuriy Reshetov told TASS on the eve of his departure for the conference. Reshetov heads the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Department for International Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights.

Reshetov pinpointed national problems among the topics to be discussed in Copenhagen. "This is linked not only with out internal problems," he stressed. "A glance at the map of Europe suffices to see seats of national tension there. We are prepared to discuss the entire complex of national problems, particularly the issue of national minorities. As a matter of fact, there is no such term in many Western states. Several Western states have declared themselves indivisible. Ours is the only country where the right to self-determination, up to and including secession, is guaranteed constitutionally."

"The forthcoming forum," Reshetov continued, "is expected to discuss questions of free elections and political pluralism. We are not side-stepping the discussion of these problems, but we believe it is necessary first and foremost to work out common criteria of what the term political pluralism means. This also refers to elections or control over them."

"The Copenhagen forum's success," Reshetov believes, "will depend substantially on the participation of the public. Some public functions will be held simultaneously with the official conference in Copenhagen. A large Soviet delegation will take part in them. It was formed on the initiative of the Helsinki Commission of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries. For us, diplomats, it is very important that our voice be heard in the chorus of the international public. The delegation of the Soviet Foreign Ministry will follow attentively the parallel functions and is ready for broad contacts."

'Roundtable' Discusses Summit, Reunification

LD0306155790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 3 Jun 90

["International Observers Roundtable" program, chaired by Boris Andrianov, with Gennadiy Vedenyapin, All-Union Radio political commentator and Yuriy Kornilov, TASS political observer]

[Excerpts] [Andrianov] The state visits of the USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to Canada and the United States have been events of world importance. That is true above all, indeed, of the new Soviet-U.S. summit held during the week now ending.

[Vedenyapin] It's not for nothing, of course, that the attention of the international public has been glued, as they say, to the capital of the United States. It's easy to see why—because the issues discussed at the talks between the leaders of our two countries are of vital

importance to all inhabitants of our planet. The talks were preceded by a whole series of direct contacts at summit level which formed the subject of analysis and prediction by diplomats, politicians, and journalists. [passage omitted on Japanese Foreign Ministry spokesman Watanabe stressing its importance]

[Kornilov] [passage omitted on Willy Brandt's hope for its success, and world press comments in similar vein]

[Andrianov] I imagine we'll have more to say about this later on in our conversation. Nonetheless, I want to acquaint listeners with the opinion expressed before the talks between the two presidents began by former U.S. Secretary of State, George Shultz. [passage omitted on Shultz, a veteran of five summits who said there was a good chance of signing an agreement on strategic offensive arms this year; Vedenyapin recalls Malta summit and strong public interest in disarmament and arms control; Kornilov says Gorbachev's visit to Canada was short, busy, and important; Andrianov says the Canada visit picked threads of Mulroney's visit to Moscow last year; Vedenyapin says Gorbachev and Mulroney noted the successful development of relations]

[Kornilov] [passage omitted on East-West relations being discussed in Ottawa, with special attention to "external aspects of German unification and the role of the North Atlantic Alliance in Europe"; Gorbachev spoke of need to preserve strategic balance.] The persistent desire to prove that the NATO membership of a united Germany would not harm the Soviet Union—and the Canadian prime minister, incidentally, also attempted to do this—is unconvincing in face of the fact that insistence on precisely this, and on this option alone, in itself arouses suspicion.

As we know, the Soviet Union considers that the discussion on the external aspects of German unification is not yet over, while the NATO countries assume that it is. Is it not obvious that such approach runs counter to just that main positive trend in the world which presupposes trust?

[Andrianov] [passage omitted on how we must be extremely careful and responsible when making decisions which could affect the whole course of world development]

[Vedenyapin] [passage omitted on responsible dialogue being needed in rapidly changing world.] It is very important that our president's conversation with the prime minister of Canada took place immediately before his visit to the United States and the summit with President Bush.

[Kornilov] Well, as for the meeting with President Bush: the reactions to that meeting run to millions of pages in newspapers and magazines and thousands of kilometers of teleprinter sheets. Of course they are not all similar. If we extract the main points from the statements and articles there is every reason to say that, from whatever angle the politicians, experts, or journalists have approached the agenda of the Washington dialogue, they all agree that even today, at a period when the trenches of the cold war are disappearing, the problem of strengthening peace and of disarmament remains a problem of the first importance—the task of tasks. Mankind cannot afford to spend $1 trillion a year on arms while a billion people in the world are going hungry, the U.S. public organization Bread for Peace declared on the eve of Gorbachev's visit to the United States.

[Andrianov] Well, in this statement, as far as I understand it, it is primarily the developing countries which are dealt with: Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Mont Blancs, weapons are of course a dangerous and heavy burden, not only for these countries but also for the United States and for other Western states, in the first instance for those who are members of the NATO bloc. Our country, living through such a difficult and complex stage in its development, standing on the threshold of drastic reforms called upon to render our economy more healthy, sees—and these days we talk about this frankly—a sharp reduction in military spending without, of course, damage to our security as one of the important linchpins summoned to extricate us from the crisis.

[Vedenyapin] It is correct of course, Boris Vasilyevich, that disarmament is one of the key points in the Washington dialogue. But in this point itself there is on the agenda, as it were, a pivotal element of its own—a reduction in the most powerful and threatening weapons which Moscow and Washington have at their disposal, that is in strategic weapons. It is not coincidental that in his first speech on U.S. soil, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed, I quote, that the distinctive feature and the significance of the current summit was first and foremost that people expected from it the first major decision on a reduction in these very strategic offensive weapons. A day later, a joint statement was issued on behalf of the two presidents on the main clauses of the future treaty on the 50 percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons. Thus the statement on the next stage of the talks on the problem at hand.

[Kornilov] The next stage. But surely, it is not so long ago that people were saying that the decision to reduce strategic weapons would be reached during the Washington talks themselves. What has happened, was an agreement not reached?

[Andrianov] That is quite the case. Or, if you wish, it is not at all the case. The reduction in strategic offensive weapons is not only the most important but it is also the most complex of all of the disarmament problems. The talks on this problem, and I remind you they have been underway since 1982, represent a difficult, a very difficult process. What is important here? I think that the first place should not be allotted to the issue of what results have been achieved in relation to some previously planned event or other, even if this is a summit meeting. I would give first place to the clearly and firmly expressed political will of both sides to achieve success on the basis of reasonable compromise. But I would also

put forward to this same first place the fact that however complex, however difficult talks may be, things are moving forward, step by step, and the result is evident. Following on from the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles, another major and—the main thing—realistic step is being taken, to be more precise has already been taken, so as to remove the nuclear threat forever from the life of humanity.

[Vedenyapin] I agree with you, Boris Vasilyevich, it is precisely so. After all, it is not for nothing that President Bush described the documents signed as historical. This, as far as can be judged, is far from the only problem whose resolution has become closer as a result of the current Soviet-U.S. summit. I mean in the disarmament sphere. Documents of such paramount importance have been signed in Washington as an agreement on the elimination and non-production of chemical weapons, a protocol on the talks on nuclear tests, a protocol on the talks on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, and finally a joint statement was made on the talks on conventional arms which are taking place, as you know, in Vienna.

[passage omitted on Kornilov also agreeing that the agreements reached are important; he recalls Gorbachev's speech in Washington where he speaks about the dangers implicit in dismantling the cold war structures and the complexity of the process. Andrianov says that the meeting should demonstrate that practical steps are being taken in the creation of a non-violent world and states that the overall picture is not simple. He quotes a recent WASHINGTON POST report that the Pentagon has started new experiments on the Star Wars program and asks how this should be understood in the light of current disarmament as well as agreements and articles in the same newspaper expressing fears about the extent of Soviet military strength and its possible implications if the international climate changes]

[Vedenyapin] Well, to tell the truth, we have ourselves in our time given certain grounds for the intimidation of the Western man in the street. We now know that the overall volume of military spending not so long ago reached 18 percent of national income in our country. There are few countries in the world, you know, who could afford this, perhaps not a single state. Not a single state had such a thing. But our Army of 4 million, I add, even today surpasses the U.S. Army in numbers twofold.

[passage omitted on Kornilov summming up current Soviet defense policies—the doctrine of reasonable sufficiency, the freezing of military spending, conversation, and the withdrawal of troops from East Europe and asks why what has already been done by the Soviet Union is not recognized by certain circles in Europe and the United States]

[Andrianov] Of course strange—let us put it like this—topics may be encountered in the U.S. press. I will cite as an example articles by the not unknown authors of dubious sensations, Evans and Novak, which appeared on the eve of the summit meeting on the pages of THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper. In one of their opuses, they levelled the accusation that Moscow was, allegedly, refusing to dismantle the Krasnoyarsk radar station. In another they asserted that Soviet arms production was increasing. I will state frankly that both of these are pure inventions. All the same I would not undertake to maintain the American readers today, in their masses, are misinformed and do not know the true state of affairs. This same WASHINGTON POST only a few days ago, citing the results of an opnion poll, reported that if 18 months ago more than half of Americans saw the main threat as Soviet military power, then today only 20 percent of them do so.

[Vednyapin] Well, this process is a natural one. In my view it once again confirms that, in our times, it is immeasurably more difficult to manipulate facts and it is immeasureably more dificult to turn white to black. But on the other hand, the 20 percent which THE WASHINGTON POST writes about is no small number. This means after all that every fifth citizen of the United States still, in one way or another and to some extent or other, believes the rubbish about Moscow's aggresiveness. If the classic question is put: to whose advantage is this? then the answer—do not let listeners reproach me with adherence to the old cliche—the answer will be in general unambiguous. It is, of course, the producers of arms and various types of "Ultras" who are not at all in smypathy with our prestroyka and who have no interest in a further improvement in the political climate when, in the words of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the mist of prejudice, lack of trust and enemity is lifting.

[Kornilov] And yet, as aginst those forces, the present summit meeting gives a powerful boost to the movement towards a new and wiser world. The political landscape has changed, but the military situation is lagging behind those changes, said U.S. Secretary of State Baker addressing a White House press conference recently on 23 May. Now, summing up the first results of the Soviet-U.S. summit dialogue, we are entitled to express a fully justified confidence that that lagging behind will be noticeably reduced and is already being reduced.

[Andrianov] In itself, the list of the Soviet-U.S. documents signed during the summit meetings speaks eloquently of how rich has been the palette of the talks between George Bush and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. It's not at all surprising that the German question occupied an important place at the talks. It was fitting that it should since what is at stake is the future of Europe, and therefore the model of a new world which we all so badly need.

[Kornilov] Yes, it's very far from being a simple issue. Because if the overcoming of the splitting of the German nation removes what is possibly the most significant hotbed of tension in Central Europe, the integration of a united Germany into NATO, on which the West is so strongly insisting, would so far alter the corelation of forces on the continent that it would not fail to arouse—

and is, indeed, already arousing—concern and at times alarm among many West Europeans.

In general, one can say that the situation that has now developed on the continent is unique and if we assume that a future unified Germany will occupy a position midway between the two blocs—the Warsaw bloc and the North Atlantic bloc—it could , without any doubt, help to bring about a decisive turn on the continent from confrontation to close interaction and the final overcoming of the split. But if such a Germany becomes merely a member of NATO, this would mean, in my view, only one thing: that the West is after all still putting its stake on the policy of acting from strength. Need one say, in such a case, how negatively that would affect all the positive processes that are now gathering strength and how much it would worsen the climate of trust?

[Andrianov] There aren't many politicians now in the West who would venture to claim that the Warsaw Pact poses a threat to security. So what sense could there be, in the circumstances, in attaching a united Germany to the military machine of NATO? [passage omitted on Vedenyapin saying French Defense Minister Chevenement says a new system of collective security is needed; Kornilov says Bush thinks a unified Germany in NATO would be no threat to the Soviet Union but should enhance stability in Europe; Andrianov says it was agreed that the issue will be studied in greater depth by foreign ministers and experts. Improved understanding is a hopeful sign. New structures, relations, and security guarantees are necessary; Vedenyapin says there is no lack of goodwill on the Soviet side. De Maziere says the USSR has proposed many models of the status of a future Germany. Moscow and Washington are willing to seek an optimal solution.]

[Kornilov] Well, if we're talking about the present time, then for Washington Germany's participation in NATO is an all-important matter of principle; and from our viewpoint this creates enormous problems. Perhaps in this case it is better to answer the question of what the North Atlantic bloc will be like in the foreseeable future, and what its relations with the Warsaw Pact will be.

[Vedenyapin] [passage omitted on how some people think Germany in NATO would not create a military situation dangerous to the USSR. Perhaps they believe the psychological factor—including "the inertia of the kind of thinking associated with the military blocs and the stereotypes that have not yet disappeared"—would predominate. Military confrontation certainly still exists, but NATO is changing and is about to review its entire strategy.] I think the Washington administration's decision not to modernization the U.S. tactical nuclear weapons in West Europe and its willingness to begin eliminating them is also one of the results of the positive changes that are happening in the NATO structures. I am, of course, far from idealizing the situation in the world, but I'm not inclined either to be excessively afraid of the image of the enemy which is now—and we acknowledge this—being increasingly eroded.

[Andrianov] However that may be, the West cannot fail to take into consideration our negative attitude to German membership of the North Atlantic Alliance. Here everyone is going to have to look for solutions that are, shall we say, not of a very conventional kind. Many political observers assume that what is most likely to happen at the next meeting of the Six in June is that a compromise will be achieved according to the formula which is being proposed by West German Foreign Minister Genscher. In other words, the reduced NATO troops will not be transferred to the East, where our units will remain for some set period. Such a situation appears paradoxical. But on examination, it would only be a consequence of the anachronism which bloc thinking represents today. That same situation would prompt a search for further solutions; and here, actually, a global compromise seems realistic only on the basis of turning both blocs into politico-military entities and creating general European security structures. That won't, of course, be achieved tomorrow; but I don't think it can be avoided.

[Kornilov] Yes, the idea of universal unity is becoming more and more dominant in the world, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in one of his speeches in Washington. Its practical embodiment, as he stressed, is an epochal task.

[Andrianov] There we end our roundtable meeting. All those taking part thank you for your attention, esteemed listeners. Goodbye, and all the best.

NATO Concepts for European Strategy Criticized

PM0106142790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 May 90 First Edition p 3

[V. Pustov "Observer's Column": "Dangerous Defects"]

[Text] An official Pentagon spokesman has confirmed press reports about defects in W-79 nuclear artillery shells. Defects were discovered in munitions stored at dumps not only in the United States but also in Italy and the Netherlands back in 1988, and, given "certain conditions," the possibility of a "nuclear device detonating" is not ruled out. An alarming new piece of news will soon appear in THE WASHINGTON POST: Speaking at impromptu hearings in Congress, the leaders of three U.S. laboratories conducting research in the sphere of nuclear weapons stated that all short-range nuclear-tipped U.S. missiles should be removed from aircraft since they pose an unacceptable security risk. It is a question of SRAM-AS missiles, which are fitted to the B-1B and B-52 strategic bombers, as well as to the FB-111 medium-range bombers designed for combat standby duty in Europe.

These new facts confirm that a fatal danger could overtake mankind even in peacetime—in connection with the very existence of mountains of deadly weaponry. This danger is piled on top of the no less threatening dangers stemming from military confrontation and inertia with respect to force as a tool of bloc policy. All

this naturally causes great concern. The need to demilitarize the European and world process as a whole is becoming particularly obvious at a time when an increasingly positive impact is being made on its development by new political thinking and the changes in the USSR and the countries of East Europe.

To a certain extent this was reflected in the work of the recent NATO Military Planning Committee session. Its participants recognized the need to make changes to the bloc's strategy—adopted during the "cold war" period—by adapting it to the new political situation taking shape in Europe. It is noted, for instance, that the concept of "forward-based defense" should be reviewed since the "forward line" itself would disappear in the form in which it had been viewed in the West hitherto. The GDR, the CSFR [Czech and Slovak Federated Republic], Hungary, and Poland are no longer considered potential enemies by NATO. Moreover, for the first time in its history the NATO alliance has adopted a decision on certain reductions in future military spending.

Given the likely importance of these and other measures, we cannot fail to note what I would call their quite vague nature. First and foremost this applies to strategic installations. It is not clear what new concepts such as "minimal defense" and "minimal deterrence" will be like. Will the notorious "nuclear deterrence" concept be reviewed and to what extent? Hitherto the gamble on nuclear weapons has been based on the Warsaw Pact's advantage in conventional arms. However, even under the new conditions, nuclear weapons are being allotted key importance within NATO. Moreover, the question is being raised of improving them by replacing the nuclear weapons already in Europe with more accurate and longer-range weapons. There is not even any hint as yet of an abandonment of the first-use of nuclear weapons.

The guiding hand of the United States can largely be seen in this. It is Washington that is showing particular activeness in embellishing the appearance of NATO by giving it credit for maintaining peace during the "cold war" period and promising that it would make a positive contribution to future European building. This is linked not only with the attempts to include a united Germany in the bloc. Washington sees NATO—with its continuing military presence and U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe—as the guarantee of the maintenance of its dominating position in the Western community. The idea currently under discussion of the creation of "multinational formations" in order, as THE NEW YORK TIMES notes, to make the siting of U.S. troops in Germany "more acceptable to the local public" is directly bound up with this too.

For the Soviet Union, NATO remains a symbol of a confrontational approach incompatible with the building of the all-European home. The news of the existence of dangerous defects in U.S. nuclear weapons, including those sited in European countries, THE WASHINGTON POST stresses, has wrong-footed the Pentagon. We cannot allow "defects" in the U.S.-NATO scenario for the development of events in Europe to wrong-foot the peoples of our continent.

United States & Canada

Gorbachev, Mulroney Hold Joint Press Conference

LD0106104290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1620 GMT 31 May 90

[Excerpts] Ottawa, 31 May. (TASS)—On the conclusion of talks, USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and Canadian Prime Minister B. Mulroney held a joint news conference on Thursday [as received].

[Mulroney] President Gorbachev and I, as well as Shevardnadze and Clark, USSR and Canadian foreign ministers, have just finished a number of extremely productive meetings on issues of East-West relations and also several meetings devoted to our very important bilateral relations. We regard the president's visit as very important and useful for our mutual relations. We are very grateful for the time which has been allotted for the visit, especially on the eve of the extremely important summit meeting which is to begin in Washington tomorrow.

Among the specific issues to which we have devoted particular attention is the German issue—as was to be expected—and also the role of NATO in the developing situation in Europe. This has occupied a significant portion of our time. It seems to me that we have had an extremely good exchange of opinions. I think that the president's visit has served to improve relations between Canada and the Soviet Union.

[Gorbachev] The prime minister has already informed you of our meeting and the problems discussed. [passage omitted]

[Question] Mr. Mulroney, when you went to Moscow last year, you signed a number of agreements on cooperation designed to reduce environmental pollution in the Arctic. This has not worked very well since. Did you discuss these issues, and can you see other ways of exchanging Canadian technology with the Soviet Union?

[Mulroney] Yes, we did actually discuss these issues. Clark and Shevardnadze discussed them, too. Moreover, progress was achieved in all areas covered by the political declaration and agreements concluded in Moscow. It stands to reason that in some areas the progress was less impressive than in others. We understand the significance of the challenge we are facing in the Arctic. Both Canada and the Soviet Union are committed to the task of cleaning up this vast "common yard" of ours and to its protection. During our talks, President Gorbachev several times made direct mention of the fact that both our countries should make this a national priority. Both countries are committed to doing just that.

[Question] Mr. Gorbachev, did you express sympathy with the prime minister who is facing problems in his country which are fairly similar to your own? I mean pacifying growing nationalism. How do you approach the problem of pacifying nationalism within your federations?

[Gorbachev] Yes, this problem did feature, and we analyzed it philosophically and politically. The fact that the world is changing and that democratic processes are, nonetheless, the basis for these changes gives impetus to a revival of national dignity and to a new treatment of the nationalities issue, and all the more so since there is no shortage of problems in these relations. This is a fact, and we are looking at it as a positive thing. Where it is a matter of a revival of the nationalities issue and of national dignity and where it is a matter of a people and its history, language, and culture, of preserving an identity, it seems to me that all this is progressive and deserves to be reflected in contemporary politics.

This is undoubtedly the case, but as always alongside this, or perhaps in connection with it or instead of it, phenomena do emerge which have a negative character. What do I mean? Where there are elements of nationalism which then grow into ethnic strife then find their extreme expression and spill over into separatism, all this cannot fail to give rise to concern. All the same I think, and our experience speaks of this, that there can be no dragging of feet in this policy; these impulses must be caught and the changes adequately expressed in specific structures, institutions, and forms of implementing the nationalities issue and everything that is linked to its revival. I think that in time it will all settle into a normal cultural and democratic channel, and a process of harmonizing relations will take place.

I can see no other approach that would replace what we are proclaiming and insisting upon. We must aspire to living together and to good cooperation and, most importantly, the individual—irrespective of nationality and in whatever place in the country, and I think we should put it like this, in the whole world—must enjoy equal rights and be protected by the Constitution and the laws. There must be no other approach. Because where there are signs of the slightest discrimination or restrictions of whatever kind, division into migrants, emigrants, etc, a situation of a negative kind immediately arises, conflict is exacerbated and takes on a social and political coloring.

To sum up then: We are examining the issue of the prospects for developing relations between the nationalities in our union, proceeding from the fact that our federation is in need of revolutionary and fundamental changes. The republics must have genuine sovereignty and economic independence and, certainly too, extensive, the most extensive, opportunities for the development of culture and language and for preserving all their traditions. That is how we will act. [passage omitted]

Since this question was also addressed to me, I want to note that it comes up every time I speak in public and, especially, when I meet the press. You have noticed that my views do not change: You don't hear one thing from me on Monday and something completely different on Friday. There are some fundamental things on the basis

of which we are seeking answers and solutions to fundamental, difficult problems. As president, I have a mandate from the Third Congress of People's Deputies.

Incidentally, that congress was placed in a difficult position. The congress was convened in connection with the introduction of the institution of the presidency. And suddenly in Lithuania, where the second round of elections was supposed to take place at the end of the month, they hurriedly, hastily, impetuously brought forward the elections, so that a hastily summoned session of the new Lithuanian Supreme Soviet could be held on 11 March, the day before the congress opened in Moscow. In general, this was something of an overnight conspiracy, hatched in a haphazard manner. It was a case of deciding first, then wondering later how to get out of the situation that was "created at night." Even when more elementary issues are concerned, they are prepared, discussed at a first reading, and sometimes published for discussion by the people so they can be submitted at a session. The views of voters are then summarized. The issues go back to the session again and are examined, taking all that discussion into account. Even simple questions are decided this way.

Then suddenly you act as you have done toward the very people with whom you have been cooperating, over such a question as secession from the Soviet Union, to which Lithuania has belonged for 50 years, of which it is a real part even now, enjoying the common opportunities and resources, taking part in comprehensive exchanges with the other republics? Well, OK, you are using your constitutional right. The constitution gives you the right, and you leave. But you will never get away from your neighbors, with whom you have lived alongside and together for centuries, from the market which you have enjoyed, traded on, for centuries. So, why do you go and act this way!?

But this is not the sole problem. Even in Lithuania, where indigenous inhabitants make up the greater part of the population, there are still 800,000 non-Lithuanians. What are you going to do with them? And what about the defense installations, missiles and naval bases—what are you going to do about them? Five of the present-day rayons did not belong to Lithuania when it joined the Soviet Union in 1940. They were ceded by Belorussia.

In other words, these people are adventurists! It was quite simply bad luck for us that, at a time when the country had entered the phase of profound reforms to the federation and we were moving step by step along this path after careful consideration, political adventurists should have taken over the leadership of that republic. I told them that myself. And I say it publicly to the entire world. They deserve precisely that political label. They have played on nationalist sentiment and exploited it for the sake of their own unfulfilled political ambitions. Everything has gotten mixed up here. But if you are guided by emotion and insult, it is no longer politics. It is more akin to a game of football or hockey in which you can work off your emotions.

Politics requires responsible decisions and actions. The Soviet president has a single mandate given him by the congress: to restore constitutional order. I must say that there is very great pressure on the president within the country. Why, people are asking, doesn't he take drastic steps? When Americans I was talking to asked "what are you going to do about Lithuania?", I replied: We will resolve it in our own way, in keeping with the style and atmosphere of perestroyka. But resolve it we definitely will. The use of extreme measures cannot be ruled out. But we want to avoid that. The Americans would have put an end to a similar situation facing them in 24 hours. Ten years has been set aside for the withdrawal of New Caledonia, France's overseas territory. But it has been decided that we should be given only 10 hours. This is a joke.

[Question] On the membership and future of Germany in NATO: Were you able to bring your points of view slightly closer or not at all?

[M.S. Gorbachev] We have a common understanding that everything affecting the internal processes of German unification is a matter for the Germans themselves. We sympathize with this and are attentive to it. Although the Germans themselves must also, putting it in a friendly way, get away from euphoria and get down to business since there are no fewer problems there than in the external aspects of unification. However, let the Germans sort it out themselves. If they ask for advice, we'll give it. Meanwhile, our topic with Prime Minister Mulroney is linked to the external conditions of the German unification process. I have to say that we had a very sound conversation about it. Personally I think that there are reserves for searching, for bringing our points of view closer. Evidently, an option is possible that would not be like the one the West is proposing today, just one option. I can see no searching, no thought there. The NATO representatives are, to a certain extent, trying to dictate. That will not do at all.

As for the Soviet Union, we are thinking. We have moved from one proposal to two, then three... I set them out in Moscow. And they all merit some work and some thought. I want to underline a most important notion, and I would ask the journalists to pay attention to this: We are living in a new Europe, a changing Europe and changing, I think, for the better. As a result of these changes, rapprochement has begun in place of confrontation and divergences. We have begun to know one another better, even to trust one another. This has enabled us to arrive at making very important decisions. And that is a most important fact.

And you who describe events confirm that this is so. So then, I think, the most important thing is that we need to look at the question of the future of a united Germany from the point of view of the external conditions. And to look for an option that would facilitate the general positive process and even strengthen it, rather than an option that could ruin the process on which we are placing so many hopes and to dislodge the positive

orientation of the European processes. And that means dislodging the most central point of international politics.

For this reason it is necesary to think responsibly. An option that places either one of the sides in a position where doubts occur as to whether it impinges upon its security then leads to suspicion: What plans are being concocted and just what do they want to achieve with this option? In this instance perhaps they want more, to make NATO an instrument during the changes to expand the spheres of influence? But then we have an old stereotype, a return to the "Cold War," a no-win situation, exacerbation. The opposite side then has to think what it should do. It will take a time-out and discuss it: what's going on! And what is to be done with the military, political, and other processes which are in progress? What is to become of Vienna? And the unilateral steps we've taken and still intend to take? Should we continue them or ought we to restrict them? After all, these are all very serious matters.

You know, if someone hopes that, as they claim, the Soviet Union has gotten involved in perestroyka and that they can catch fish in troubled waters, I would like to disillusion such people. That won't stick. It is a very superficial judgement. I would say it is a destitute philosophy. And a destitute philosophy leads to destitute policies. And there our trouble will be shared.

I told the representatives of TIME magazine: The foreign aspects of German unification are a secondary issue. The primary issue is the process of profound changes in the world which is underway and which promises to create a different international situation and to bring us to international relations of an entirely different character. There will be failures and moments of various kinds in this magnificent process. We must always remember the most important thing and not lose sight of the main trend of world events.

The prime minister and I had a good and serious exchange of views on this topic. I am thinking and Mr. Mulroney will be thinking, and I also took his arguments on board. I think that while I am en route Mr. Mulroney will communicate them to Washington. They can have a think there, too. There's a solid conversation ahead. [passage omitted: Mulroney says that the German question should not be allowed to get in the way of a successful summit dialogue between Gorbachev and Bush]

[Question] Comrade Gorbachev, first and foremost, as one of the few representatives of the Canadian socialist press in this country, I would like to say that your visit here is a truly great achievement. We hope that you will return. My question is about your plans for complete disarmament by the year 2000. Do you consider that we have come closer to this?

[Mulroney] I want to express disagreement with my friend's words. The socialist press to which he belongs is not thinly represented in Canada.

[Question] At all events I think it is in this hall.

[Mulroney, laughining] The Canadian press is very well and very fairly represnted. A very wide variety of views....

[Question] Was my question quite clear? As I understand it, some years ago you put forward a plan for the achievement, in cooperation with the United States, of complete disarmament on both sides, by the year 2000. As you approach your meeting with President Bush, do you consider that we are now closer to this?

[Gorbachev] I am glad to greet a socialist. Of course, I do not forget about things which I propose, especially when it is the initiative which was proclaimed on 15 January 1986. In order to confirm that I have not forgotten about it, I must correct you: My proposal was that by the year 2000 there should be a nuclear-free, nonviolent world, and full disarmament, not only between the Soviet Union and the United States.

That's the first thing. Secondly: There may have been a subtext in your question, a little bit of skepticism, I would say. This doesn't bother me, you know. I am happy to answer your question. Here is why: When this initiative was proclaimed, the first reaction of all you journalists, of many politicians and political scientists was that it was another illusion, a utopia. But time has passed, and we have already scrapped the first class of nuclear weapons. Time is passing and we are close to taking very fundamental measures as regards chemical weapons, which will be the subject of one of our decisions in Washington. We have indeed made great progress as regards a 50-percent reduction in strategic nuclear, offensive armaments. I think that important work will be done in Washington and that it will meet with understanding. I won't anticipate everything, but there is a chance that great progress will be made at the Washington summit on the fundamental question of reducing armaments.

And thirdly: I was not talking merely of nuclear weapons and a nonviolent world. I was also referring to conventional weapons and proposing a reduction in their level, too, for the world is overburdened with weapons. The fact that negotiations are under way in Vienna and that progress is being made there, too, in spite of all the difficulties, shows that this is a vital process. From the viewpoint of the specific range of issues, it does not really matter much when precisely this process finishes—by 2000 or 2005. After all, we are talking of enormous problems. The important thing is that this process has started and is now solidly under way.

[Mulroney] Ladies and gentlemen, Mr. President, Mrs. Gorbacheva: I thank you yet again. In conclusion, I wish to express to you gratitude on behalf of the people and government of Canada. I extend my best wishes for a safe journey to all representatives of the press and, of course, to all members of the president's delegation . Thank you everyone.

[Gorbachev] As my last words to the people of Canada, I wish to express sincere thanks for your hospitality and friendship, for the openness which I myself, all my colleagues, and Raisa Maksimovna, encountered here during these two short days. We felt this warmth and sincerely thank you all. The Canadian people can count on the friendship and cooperation of the Soviet people. Goodbye.

Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to U.S.

Gorbachev Addresses Intelligentsia

LD0106212190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Speech by USSR President Gorbachev at a meeting with representatives of U.S. intelligentsia in Washington on 31 May—recorded]

[Excerpt] Washington, 1 June—M.S. Gorbachev met representatives of the U.S. intelligentsia at the Soviet Embassy yesterday. Those present included: A. Bromley, science adviser to the President; H. Kissinger, former secretary of state; F. Press, president of the National Academy of Sciences; M. Sovern, president of Columbia University; Professor S. Cohen, a well-known historian; J. Jackson, a prominent figure in the black movement; Susan Eisenhower, president of the Eisenhower World Afairs Institute; the prominent economists K. Galbraith and Nobel Prize-winner W. Leontief; the surgeon R. Gale, who helped the victims of Chernobyl; the cinema actors Gregory Peck, Douglas Fairbanks, and Jane Fonda; the pianist Van Cliburn; the writer Isaac Asimov; B. Lown, chairman of the organization "Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War"; television company owner T. Turner; and others.

Soviet academics, journalists, men of letters, and artists were present at the meeting. They included Academicians D.S. Likhachev, Ye.M. Primakov, Yu.A. Osipyan, S.S. Shatalin, G.A. Arbatov, Yu.A. Ryzhkov and R.Z. Sagdeyev; O.N. Yefremov, Ismailov Tofic Kyzazim-Ogly, Z.L. Sotkilava, M.V. Pletnev, B.F. Rakhimova, O.R. Latsis, A.Ye. Bovin, G.A. Borovik, L.A. Arutyunyan, V.A. Martynov and G.A. Yagodin. M.S. Gorbachev spoke at the meeting.

[Gorbachev] Esteemed gentlemen! I great you cordially. Thank you and my Soviet colleagues who have arrived here in Washington for very important work.

A similar meeting took place during my last visit. I had the impression then that it was one of the highlights of the visit. Therefore, I have had a desire to meet representatives of U.S. intellectuals again. Many things in society take this or that course depending on how this part of any society works. The best people and talents are the strength of each nation, and a nation perishes, or, in any case, becomes seriously ill if its talents are not employed or if a nation has no opportunity to express and explain what it lives through and what its worries are. We have done a lot in our country now to ensure that those who wanted and had to say anything important and substantial to the people could do so.

It is also true that there is too much talking now. You have noticed this. Even apprehensions have been voiced on your sides: Are the Russians to ever calm down and get down to work? Perhaps this is caused by the fact that for a long time the things that had accumulated in all of us could not find an outlet. After all, this is a huge world—300 million people, 120 languages which means 120 nationalities. And this is not all... we will sort our problems out. We have not yet sorted them out completely. The main point is the following: Having understood our country and history, the first conclusion we draw for ourselves was that we could not go on living like that. This was said on 11 March, at night. [Raisa adds: "The 10th!"] Overnight, from the 10th to the 11th. [laughter] Just try to add anything! [laughter] [Raisa adds: "Yes!"]

A day later I was elected general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and had to think: All right, one cannot carry on like that, but how should one live? Our guest has started since then. Here, among you, are my comrades in perestroyka who are working in order that perestroyka gain pace, unfold both in scale and depth and make the country face the world around it, open up.

None of this is simple. I am continually asked: But if again, after having been through that five-year experience, you returned to March 1985, would you have taken the same road or a different one? I am convinced: After five years of search, daring, doubts and experiences—and today is the peak of all these experiences, and I'll tell you why—I want to say unequivocally that we have simply no other road, neither is there a road block.

You would like to know, of course—what is happening in the Soviet Union today, especially as there are so many people here who write about our perestroyka?

I am continually repeating and today I told your President: We want to receive an answer to at least two main questions and we are ready to give our answer. The first: What kind of a Soviet Union do you want to see? The second: What kind of a United States do we want to see? Briefly speaking, the point of my answer can be summed up in a simple thought. Two powerful states and two mighty peoples must be together at a responsible turning point in the life of civilization when the world is drawn into profound changes. Let us think what "together" means. Mr. Kissinger is someone who has argued with me for a long time. Whenever I want to say something critical, I call things by their name! Although, I must say, I can see that even Mr. Kissinger is changing in the spirit of stimuli offered by life! This does him credit. What does it mean to be together?

We can be rivals, though even that is a great step from the situation when we were enemies and confronted each other, and how! But in my view, if we think everything over, we will arrive at a more mature conclusion. There is a documentary film called "A Century-Long

Romance." This is a film describing how relations between our countries have been taking shape in the 20th century.

It is staggering, you feel stunned when you see everything collected there compressed in two hours. How many times have we (the USSR and the United States) begun, only to go our separate ways again? That is why it is very important now that the chance which we have again received should not be missed. I appeal especially to those sitting here. I know many of you from what you have written. A few I know personally. You are people who reflect, who are anxious about the destiny of your states and about what is happening around you. You come to the conclusion that new approaches are necessary, that one must look at one another in a new way, widen the degree of agreement and cooperation. One must go from rivalry to partnership.

We won't be fidgety, we won't be hasty. Turnarounds of such a scale simply do not happen just like that. It is only back home in Lithuania that they can assemble in the night, raise their hands and say: We have seceded from the Soviet Union. Then they start thinking about what to do. They don't know what to do, and we dont't know what to do with them! [laughter] This is one—if you can call it that—way of resolving the problem. But there is a more correct one—it is one common to all mankind: measure seven times, cut once. Now, during the years of perestroyka, I think one must sometimes measure a hundred times... and all the same one does not manage without errors, although they are, probably, explainable.

So then we won't hurry. We are going from confrontation towards rivalry and from rivalry towards partnership, although this has not yet been achieved. This would be a great gain. If we meet one another half way along this path, this would be a great turnaround for our two countries. Our peoples, at any rate the great bulk of them, will make friends and cooperate, if, of course, you and I help reinforce this trend and do not spoil it. We can also spoil it—it is no use denying this!

There are many here who are masterly wielders of the word and who are capable of influencing the world, the more so, as the latest opinion polls show, for instance, that our people wants an improvement in relations with the United States. And people believe this to be possible. They have again remembered the war years, and the Elbe, and Van Cliburn. I am extending a cordial welcome to him here. This person has done a very great deal for the mutual understanding between our people. It turns out that there is indeed something to be remembered: and the Thirties when Americans came to help us build works, to produce these "Fords..." they have remembered everything. So, in spite of everything, the people retain this memory. This is a good thing. In exactly the same way, we sense this attitude. Somewhere—I think it was my news conference with Mr. Mitterrand—we broached these topics of what is happening in the world and how easy or hard it is to be a politician in our time. This is because previously a politician just had to make [decisions] in his office taking account of analysis and synthesizing specific phenomena. Today, it is difficult to abstract [as heard] oneselffrom the mood of the masses, the vast millions of people are no longer willing to reconcile themselves to being given a secondary role.

Discussing this, we got to talking about a fact which had simply, very pleasantly excited and struck me. For my birthday I received 50,000 congratulations from Western countries, 98 percent of them from the United States of America. And what letters! Mr Cohen has brought out a booklet entitled "Americans write to Gorbachev." What does it say? It says that there is an environment in which ideas of a rapprochement meet with a response and support, and if we really understand why we are in this world and what the place is of our two peoples in it, they, these ideas, will become invincible.

Everything is not all that simple: both in my country and in your country there are people who ask questions: but is this indeed how things stand and will the United States not deceive us? We Russians wear our hearts on our sleeves. And U.S. pragmatism has allowed such things to happen that afterwards relations were poisoned for decades. Now I am continually reading how the following questions are asked in your country: Should we believe what is happening in the Soviet Union, believe Gorbachev. Only just now, today, I have been reading that he is, so to speak, a person who does not want to change anything. He just strikes a pose with his radical arguments and democratic statements; but if you scratch the surface, below you will find a lurking commitment to everything that is old, and so on. So, there are such people in your country, too.

So then, you and I have not had more promising chances than today. We are helped to realize this is by the fact that at the crossroad we have now reached, at this steep turnaround, we have arrived more prepared, both politically and historically, and by the experience of such a war and the terrible losses which it brought, and "by the cold war," which brought us to the brink of the abyss. And, of course, by the anxiety over global problems. People have come to feel: They have been divided, divided into camps, almost into civilizations, whereas it turns out that we have one civilization, one world.

I recall that when I said at just such a meeting in 1987 that I was not a representative of the theory of convergence, but that I could see that we were one civilization, with the sun of everyone's specific features and differences, Mr Galbraith stood up and said very calmly, like a person wisened and overburdened by knowledge: Mr Gorbachev, why are you so afraid of convergence? I believe that he formulated the question correctly.

Let us reflect: If there had not been our revolution and those societies which it engendered, then—despite everything that subsequently befell us, all the distortions and everything that we experienced, powerful and liberating stimuli were given to the world: equality of rights,

justice, attention to the ordinary individual and his social protection! [sentence as received] I shall tell you bluntly: If this had not occured, capitalism would not have mobilized its resources. But a model arose, and this was a spur. People had to think about how to oppose that model, how to prove that capitalism, too, could do something for people. That's precisely what happened. They said: Plans are nonsense, regulation is nonsense. But now people are regulating and planning everything. Only how? If they are doing it as we did, that is bad; but if special tasks are being tackled, if there is a regrouping of resources and so on, then our ideas have done some good.

So, we are one civilization, with all our differences, but I don't count the differences as shortcomings but as advantages, for they are a basis for discussions, for exchanges, for reaching a higher level of knowledge. I would invite you to cooperation, to solidarity and—the main thing—to mutual understanding. That very word that we used to throw at each other without thinking, just like that, without much resulting from it, is now, I believe, acquiring its genuine meaning. We can give it back a role of common human value.

We in the USSR can feel how enormous is the interest among the U.S. intelligentsia in what is happening in our country. We welcome various forms of cooperation and ties. We can see that, instead of ideological disputes, there is an increasing quest in our meetings. And that is perhaps the most substantial turnaround. And on this subject, in general, we remain committed to our choice; we are seeking ways to interpret it and to translate it into real life. And we associate this with democracy, glasnost, and a greater degree of protection and social justice for the individual, so that there is no polarization, so to speak, and we associate it with culture. And in general, I suppose that the same problems face Americans. If we are discussing problems, perhaps we are having the harder time of it today. I told the President—and I have been saying it everywhere—if people say that perhaps pressure could be put on a weakened Soviet Union and talk about Gorbachev's weakended positions, it is not serious. How can anyone talk of the weakened positions of a person and the leaders who are here with you today, if perestroyka is underway?

All of our instabilities result from great changes and the fact that perestroyka is serious and fundamental. We are changing our political system and we are changing our economic system in the specific conditions of our country, taking account of our experience, the structure of our economy, and so on. Everything in our country won't be as it is in the United States; it won't be as it is in Germany. But it will be the way it should be in our country. Otherwise, if we start mechanically to transplant someone's model into our soil, we shall commit stupidities again. I am always afraid when someone proposes some model very quickly. A choice is necessary; a concept is necessary; but from that point we need joint creativity. Moreover, our own realities and the experience and realities of the whole of civilization must be taken into account. If we succeed indoing all this more organically, we will proceed more rapidly. But we will make progress whatever happens. We have no other option. All our answers are ahead, not behind us. The only question is at what pace and how painfully we are to go about this. That is the essential question.

But we are now at a critical stage. And perhaps we want to be correctly understood as never before. I would very much like people in our country not to panic over the fact that the deepest changes are currently underway. And, as it turned out, on Sunday [27 May] when I was out of town, making preparations for the Washington meeting, the necessity appeared to say something, just to say something and speak with the people about the market, because such passions, so to speak, had been unleashed in society. And you will have seen what happened. Both your television and ours are able to show all this immediately, quickly. And these passions flare even more as a result. Well, there is nothing you can do about it, as the saying goes: that is the reality. Well I dictated something in shorthand form by telephone, and by the time I got to Moscow they had decoded it, and I made my broadcast. I think there wasn't a single economic strategy mentioned in it, apart from the market, and also indexation... [Raisa interrupts: "emission of money"] Emission of money and indexation. Everything else that I said was in simple and broad terms, so that the discussion was along the lines of what the market is, why we need it, who is afraid of it and who isn't.

People who work well and continue to do so will not be afraid of it. People who have produced good quality output will only be encouraged by the market. Whereas the idler, of course, he who lives on subsidies and all the injections from the state, will have to reform himself. You can't behave like that. In sum, people listened. At any rate, I won't overestimate the results. Perhaps the result was actually different. I met here a gentleman who was speaking after my broadcast; he was delivering a sermon. Perhaps the sermon played more of a role than my speech in defense of the market, in which I was trying to calm things down. At any rate... Yes, it was you, yes, yes, yes! [he beckons to aperson in the audience] Perhaps. Or perhaps we'll take credit jointly. But on Monday, the [Supreme Soviet] session began with people feeling they were at a deadend. After a few days when 1000 deputies had spoken on this subject, they began to sum up the debate and came to the conclusion that the work must be continued jointly with the government and the program enriched by discussion and substantial amedments made both to the timescale and to the steps to be taken, and that must get moving.

Today, while discussing this topic an American I was talking to—not the President—said: A market economy, or the market; it is like the impossibility of being half-pregnant. I said, I agree, only, you know, before the baby is born, nine months or more have to pass. So that is how it will be with the market. Otherwise there will be a miscarriage. [Unidentified speaker says: "You can have apregnancy of just seven months!"] Seven are

possible, are they? Shatalin is for a faster pace! [laughter] But in order for there to be a child and not a miscarriage—a market and not something incomprehensible—we have to go a certain distance, go a certain distance.

We shall advance towards the market. The greatest difficulty is—and all my compatriots will confirm that—that we are still overcome by complexes. When Americans speak about the market, everything is absolutely clear to them. This implies the stock exchange and credits, the price formation mechanism, in short all the tools of the market. Whereas we have as yet practically nothing for the functioning of the proper market. We have to create the entire market infrastructure... [Raisa interrupts: "For us the market means speculation!"] For us the market means speculation, but with you speculation is the market! [laughter] You see how we must alter our way of thinking! Yes, at any rate, as far as the turnaround we are making is concerned, we would very much like to be understood by our own people, and everyone—our own people, above all.

Frankly speaking, everything now comes up against people's unpreparedness for great changes. A revolution in people's minds must take place. Then everything new will start entering life in earnest.

Be it as it may, in this great turnabout we want to be understood both by our people and everybody; by our own people, first of all.

I thank you once again. I am glad to meet all of you with whom I am linked through personal acquaintance or through your works.

Once again, I greet you cordially and I count on cooperation at this important time, a time of special responsibility, great hopes and expectations. For a long time afterwards many things will depend on how we act and understand one another now. [passage omitted: summary of speeches that followed, by such personalities as Kissinger, W. Leontief, J. Jackson, Van Cliburn, and others]

Gorbachev Speaks at Dinner 31 May

LD0106125990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0458 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Speech by USSR President Gorbachev at a dinner given in his honor by U.S. President George Bush in Washington on 31 May; "Mikhail Gorbachev's Speech at Dinner"—TASS headline]

[Text] [No dateline received] Esteemed Mr. President!

Esteemed Mrs. Bush!

Ladies and Gentlemen!

Permit me on behalf of myself and Raisa Gorbacheva, and all the members of our delegation, to express to you our gratitude for the cordiality and kind words which have been expressed.

Gentlemen! Half a century ago, Franklin Roosevelt spoke about the world of the future in which four freedoms would triumph: freedom of speech, freedom of conscience, freedom from need, and freedom from fear.

This ideal has still not been achieved in any country. Nor could it be achieved in a world of hostility and confrontation. That is why the freeing of mankind from fear draws us nearer to a new world. We are making these first steps in that direction by joining our forces together.

I am confident, that as a result of this current meeting, our countries will proceed toward a new path of interaction.

Already today these relations, which history itself has predetermined should play so important a role in the destinies and results of the 20th century, have changed strikingly in comparison with what they were before the Geneva meeting of 1985. These are the fruits of our work.

The "image of an enemy" is fading into the past, and ideological blinders are coming down. We have started to understand each other's motives. In changing and going to meet one another halfway, we have not ceased to be different, either. But this, it seems, is not such a bad thing; on the contrary, it is useful. Diversity is the vital force of development.

The whole world, too, has changed beyond recognition.

It is noticeably progressed toward a new, truly peaceful period in its thousand years of history.

Evidently, one may say with confidence that the most important and decisive step in this direction belongs to our countries. They have had the sufficient will, common sense, and realization of the situation and the imperatives of the future epoch to set out on a long and difficult path which has led from Geneva, via Reykjavik and Washington to Moscow, to New York, to Malta and now again to Washington.

I would like here, today, to repeat what I said to the President half a year ago in Malta: The Soviet Union does not see the United States as its enemy. We have firmly embarked upon a course "from mutual understanding, via cooperation toward interaction".

The improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations has reduced the threat of war. This is the most important achievement of these years. About 20 bilateral agreements in the most diverse fields have been concluded. Exchanges have also increased in an unprecedented way—this is of particular value—between our people, from schoolchildren to major scientists and economists.

Our joint work with President Bush during these days can, I think, be assessed as yet another step toward a more humane and just world.

It seems to me that of the general idea which is capturing people's minds on the threshold of the 21st century is standing out ever more clearly. That is the idea of universal unity.

Its practical implementation is an epoch-making task. The diverse nature of the world and the complexity of its problems are such that it can only be solved on paths of synthesis, at all events by the mutual infusion of the aspirations, values, achievements, and hopes of different peoples.

In a world of nuclear, ecological, and other threats, global unification is the opportunity for the survival of mankind. But mankind cannot be merely a community of survival. It must be a community of progress. Progress for everyone—East, West, North, South, for the highly-developed and the still-deprived.

Meanwhile, the very idea of progress, too, needs recomprehension. Now mankind's ascent to the implementation of the design of its history should proceed without irreparable damage to the environment, without exploitation of man and of all peoples, and without irreversible moral and spiritual losses.

It is difficult and strange to build a new civilization. We, representatives of a country in which more than a hundred peoples live together, possibly know this better than anyone else. Our own home needs a major overhaul and fundamental restructuring along the lines of reason and justice. We realize the scale of this undertaking, which is unequaled by anything mankind has ever known.

Judging by how the rest of the world responded to perestroyka, one may conclude that it is the necessary and desired element of mankind's political and philosophical potential. Therefore, in rethinking them and restructuring ourselves, we believe that we are making a contribution to the cause of universal development and human unification.

The business of creating a lasting democratic system has not yet been completed in our country. But I am convinced that the store of public energy that has already been switched into this great cause is sufficient to bring it to fruition.

I can say firmly: we shall act, taking our values as our starting-point. Act resolutely, but also circumspectly.

Our platform is aimed at taking our society towards a new quality. This will enable us to be both predictable participants in the international process, and partners of all who strive for a reliable, just, and free world. In building it, we count on longterm cooperation with the United States of America.

The main thing in the relations between our two countries, and in world politics as a whole, probably still lies ahead. It is important not to lose sight of the goal and not to succumb to the temptations and attractions of gaining one-sided advantages. It is necessary to progress towards it, overcoming both present and future difficulties and obstacles, cooperating, and interacting.

To the health of Mrs. Barbara Bush and to your health, Mr. President!
To the success and prosperity of all those present!
To a worthy today and to our common better future!
Thank you!

Gorbachev, Quayle Meet at Embassy

LD0306000390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0230 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Video report by V. Kalyagin on Gorbachev-Quayle meeting at the Soviet Embassy in Washington DC on 1 June; from the "120 Minutes" program—recorded, Quayle speaks in English with superimposed translation by Kalyagin]

[Text] [Kalyagin] A meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and U.S. Vice-President Dan Quayle took place at the USSR Embassy in Washington.

Prior to the start of the conversation an improvised news conference with journalists took place. [Video shows Gorbachev and Quayle entering a room and sitting down in winged armchairs; Gorbachev is flanked by a male interpreter and Quayle by a female interpreter]

[Quayle] I am being asked how things are proceeding.

[Gorbachev, turning to Quayle] How are things proceeding?

[Quayle] In my view things are proceeding very well. There are no problems at all. A good mood is being created. Friendly relations have been established.

[Gorbachev] I would say that, indeed, what you just said is correct, except for one phrase, perhaps: that there are no problems. [laughs loudly] When there are no problems we are not needed, including you. [Gorbachev points to some one off screen]

[Quayle] If we didn't have any problems there would be no point in meeting.

[Gorbachev] That's what I am saying.

Indeed, we are having very intense discussions. I can't remember all the problems being investigated with such thoroughness for a long time. Particularly, in the context of everything happening around the world now, taking into account this dynamic process of profound changes. I believe that this is a kind of philosophical point, but it is very important. After all, it is very important to understand correctly the role played both the Soviet Union and the United States especially at this time. This will go to shape the policies and the kind of cooperation that we will have. In that particular sense Mr. Quayle is quite right in saying that we are having good discussions in a good atmosphere and setting.

I hope that have you completed what you needed to do and I shall continue my conversation with the vice-president. Thank you.

[Kalyagin] On conclusion of the meeting the vice-president of the United States gave an interview for the "Vremya" program. [video shows Quayle and Gorbachev saying goodbye and shaking hands. Quayle walks up to Kalyagin within the Embassy with a Lenin portrait in the background]

[Kalyagin] Mr. Vice-President, how did your conversation with the Soviet president go?

[Quayle] We had a very good talk with President Gorbachev. In the past two days I participated in several meetings with him and I believe that the president has a precise understanding of how the Soviet Union should develop. He has got very convincing ideas. He is a very lively and purposeful person. We enjoyed talking to him and deeply respect him.

[Kalyagin] And what are the main subjects which you discussed?

[Quayle] We discussed space in particular, about the fact that the conquest of space is in the interests both of the United States and of the Soviet Union. We also had an all-round discussion of the situation in Latin America. The Western hemisphere is of great significance for the United States. We believe that there are great opportunities there for economic development, economic growth. I put forward the idea that the United States should play a primary role in Latin American affairs.

[Kalyagin] What do you think about the progress of the present summit meeting?

[Quayle] The summit is constructive. The negotiations are proceeding well. I was greatly impressed by the personal relationship which has arisen between President Bush and Gorbachev. This is a good, healthy relationship. They have of course different views but there also is a mutual respect and a good attitude toward one another. I think that as a result of this summit our relations will grow stronger. The meeting will promote their improvement.

[Kalyagin] Thank you very much.

[Quayle] Thank you.

'Improvised Press Conference' Noted

LD0106191390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Video report from Washington by unidentified correspondent; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] And now we once again go over to Washington:

[Correspondent] And one more improvised press conference after the latest round of talks:

[Bush in English with superimposed Russian translation] We had a very good talk this morning.

[Gorbachev] Well, it was a good talk. The important thing is that it should lead to good results.

[Unidentified reporter in English with Russian translation] Do you think there will be good results? Specific results?

[Gorbachev] See how he's putting the pressure on! That's a representative of the Soviet side. [laughter] I hope so.

[Bush in English with Russian translation] Certainly there will be on some things.

[Gorbachev] Now he's correcting me, you see?

[Unidentified reporter in English with Russian translation] There are problems? There are complications?

[Bush in English with Russian translation] We always have complications. We should measure it not by saying the glass is half empty—we should say the glass is half full.

[Gorbachev] I can tell you we've covered two-thirds of the journey of the talks. The President and I have had mostly one-on-one talks, but just now all the main forces took part in discussing the central issue—the problem of a 50 percent reduction of armed forces—and we've made a lot of progress. We still have tomorrow. I expect we'll be in a good natural setting, where there will be more oxygen, and we'll be thinking harder and will complete our discussion. It can already be said that this meeting will be an important one, but it could be still more important. Whether it will be important or more important, will be decided tomorrow.

[Unidentified reporter] Does your optimism include trade and economic relations? We are quite worried about that.

[Bush in English with Russian translation] We're still discussing these matters, which are of course very important for us, too. I'd like to add the issue of chemical weapons. I think we've come pretty close to solving it. That will be a major, important achievement if we

manage to agree. At least it will be viewed by Americans as a step of the greatest importance. Thank you all.

Gorbachev Speaks With Congressmen

LD0206175490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 2 Jun 90

["Account" of USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with U.S. Congressional leaders on 1 June at the Soviet Embassy in Washington—recorded; congressmen's statements in English with passage-by-passage translation into Russian]

[Text] [Gorbachev] It seems that many issues are being gathered together at this meeting that make it an important event. The leading issue, of course, concerns the 50 percent reductions [in strategic arms]. Let me say honestly and frankly that it is difficult to proceed toward this treaty. We have been doing much work at the present time, as we feel the Americans have been, too. In general, it is probable that some stock of experience and trust has been produced. Movement toward each other has been required. We have had to take some steps toward each other. At any rate, one may now say that this document—a statement on the main positions of the future treaty—can now be signed. Some matters will remain for further study. I think that the time has come for both our Supreme Soviet and the Congress to be fully involved in all the material of this treaty.

Indeed, I said this several times yesterday, and I want to repeat that in this instance and in other instances we proceed on the assumption that, in general, what is disadvantageous to the United States must in the long run, if one is thinking ahead, be disadvantageous for us as well. If a situation arises where our partner becomes worried or uncertain, then the goal will not have been achieved. I endeavor to approach all problems on the basis of this assumption.

Yesterday we discussed the German question—well, for brevity I shall call it the German question—and external matters connected with the unification of Germany. I really feel that the hardline position being defended by the administration over a united Germany definitely belonging to NATO essentially boils down to the fact that NATO exists, and it is through NATO that the United States has a military presence on the European Continent and thereby fulfils a definite role, both at the level of strategy and at the level of stability, if you like. Both of these things are elements of the same strategic situation in this respect. I told the President in the presence of his colleagues, and my own colleagues are here: You know, there is no debate for us over whether there should be a U.S. military presence. There is no problem. Regardless of how unification is resolved and what it requires, what new structures arise in connection with unification or how this matter is resolved, we are ready to say this.

With any structures, we proceed from the premise that, at this stage, when such changes are going on in Europe—major, serious ones—we're all committed to the preservation of stability there, so that we don't see things starting to teeter on this central axis of world politics. And if we find the process in Europe coming unhinged and a doubt is cast—either you have them or we do—I am sure, gentlemen, that it will be difficult for us to progress at all on any front.

I have tried to inform the President of this with all frankness, and I want to convey this feeling to you. If we in the Soviet Union feel that something or other, someone, is pushing us back, squeezing and wishing to obtain some kind of one-sided advantage here, this is greater than, [changes thought]—anyway, as for frightening us, who (?can frighten you or frighten us?). Who are we afraid of anyway? Since we are on the subject, we should be afraid of ourselves—that what we have stockpiled never goes into operation. This is what we must fear. And I think that we have overcome everything, so to speak, and have begun movement, and are progressing in the right direction. And there is nothing to fear concerning all the rest.

But, nonetheless, a situation may arise to throw up some kind of distortion or upsets or imbalances. Then the question arises—either you or we must sit down and think what has happened and how we should act, how we should we react to this. What should we do withour armed forces? And what about Vienna in this connection? What should we do in Vienna? This is natural.

I think that such a person as [Senator] Mr. Nunn, if the United States got into such a situation as a result of these matters, would say: We will not tolerate a situation in our committee or in Congress which would harm the United States and give us cause for concern here in Washington. Well, it is just the same in the Kremlin. [sentence indistinct] You understand? [chuckles] Everything is reflected as in a mirror.

So, we arrived here. Yesterday there were contacts with our committees of the Supreme Soviet connected with this. And on our return there will be a more specific talk there. A very serious process is going on. Therefore, even with the treaty on a 50 percent cut, we are searching, and where we see something mutually necessary, we compromise—many compromise moves have been made—on other issues as well. I would very much like to preserve this understanding, that our security, just as yours—they are mutually inseparable. These are two sides of the same coin—improving relations and rectifying the general situation. For this reason, I don't know what else can be said in support of this proposition. It seems to me that in the years we have just been through, in which an element of cooperation and even elements of trust have emerged in our relations, we have begun to act differently, to reflect more freely, and to express our views on issues openly. I look at all of you and recall that I have talked with all of you, and we were able to have a calm discussion. Generally speaking, we must act like people. Of course, we are all from that period: We all have such experience and such formulae lodged in our heads and

such a fund of data, and we all have such complexes, that it is not so simple to break with this. I know this from personal experience of domestic restructuring. If you take a step, people say it's a blow against socialism. If you take another step, they say you've destroyed the party. Take one more step, and they say you've been the undoing of the Soviet Union.

[Unidentified speaker] Constant concessions...

[Gorbachev, laughing] Yes, to mention...they say you're making concessions. If you hold any negotiations, they say you're making concessions. We have enough people like that at present. Now that people have received glasnost, they are blaring at the top of their voices. And so all that, of course...[changes thought] But I think we all have an interest in understanding properly that it is now more important than ever that we should understand each other well. Admittedly, there is an interpretation which goes like this. Let's analyze what's happening in the Soviet Union at present. Perhaps it is currently in such a state that it could be thrown flat on its back at one stroke. It's not serious. It's not serious. The story has been doing the rounds in the world press, including the U.S. press, that Gorbachev, more than any leader before him, has arrived in Washington a weak petitioner. But I don't intend to plead for anything, even when I ask pointed questions about the fact that we now ought to make headway in the sphere of trade relations, because we are currently turning toward the market. And it is important that Americans should realize this, take part in this process, and even support it. But, once again, we don't propose to take a single kopeck, nothing, for free. It'll all be as it should, on the basis of certain credits and payments at certain interest rates. That is how it should all be. It would simply be humiliating for us [otherwise], not to mention the fact that we would find other solutions.

A few days ago I met with your businessmen; there were 500 in Moscow. I told them, in general, you know that dialogue, the negotiation processes have gathered a fairly good momentum, have touched on many issues. But there is no firm ground under all the political processes and the cultural processes and exchanges. I have in mind that the foundation is nonetheless economic cooperation. Incidentally, they will probably bring pressure to bear even on you, just as they have brought pressure to bear on me as well, [saying] you politicians act. You are preventing us from cooperating. I think that that is harping at Congress, getting at Congress. It will probably give it a different meaning, will turn it around. Therefore, if one makes one's calculations on some kind of delusions, you understand, that is the most dangerous thing that one can do.

Yesterday I told the President quite frankly that we have to resolve what for us is the main issue. What is important for the Soviet Union? That there should be an unstable America torn by contradictions, or the contrary? And what is advantageous to the United States—a weak, nondemocratic, complex-suffering Soviet Union, or a democratic, dynamic state that is open to the world? In my opinion, it is clear what makes common sense.

And you know that when you reason in this manner, employing approaches like this, then we come to a different understanding of it. But if we employ another approach, then right from the start the question arises whether one cannot use something to one's advantage at his moment of instability, whether one can catch some little fish in troubled waters. But surely that isn't a policy? When I spoke in front of the businessmen, I called this a policy that is counting on the presidential term, and that counts on winning votes at the next election. That is possible to seize the moment, to take advantage of the opportunity. But that is not a serious policy. That is not a policy for such states as ours. In this complicated world, which is growing more complicated and which has started moving, I can see that the Soviet Union on its own cannot control these processes, nor can the United States provide leadership on its own. It cannot provide it. That's already an old issue. Now one must understand that by cooperating, respecting one another's interests, and of course cooperating with others, we can do a great deal that is positive. But in order to do that, we must step over a great deal, over a great deal.

I have drawn out my speech. I greet you once again here at this table, in this circle. Let's talk. We'll talk about whatever you like.

[Senator George Mitchell] Mr. President, let me begin by thanking you very much for receiving us. Thank you again for receiving our group of senators in Moscow a few weeks ago. I think that as you have met nearly everyone here more than once, I won't introduce anyone because time is limited and perhaps I'll just give my colleagues a chance to ask questions. But let me first say once again how glad I am that you have invited us. We very much hope that your meeting with the President will be productive and useful. We in the Congress will be waiting impatiently for the results of your discussions, and we hope in the near future.

First I'll ask my colleague Senator Dole to put a question to you, and then if time allows, other members of our group will be able to ask questions. At our meeting in Moscow a few weeks ago, the main issue we discussed was the economic situation in the USSR. Today you have touched on this question again. Since our meeting you have, of course, announced the new policy which will lead to an increase in prices from 1 July. As an outside observer, I think the whole economic program cannot amount only to that, so I would like to ask what other steps you would like to take within the framework of economic policy. And politically, I would like to ask whether there will be a referendum in the USSR on the price increases. For us that is like a referendum on increasing taxes here, you know, if you ask that question here in a referendum, what do you think the result will be? [chuckles]

[Gorbachev] They would bury it. [laughter] Yes. I want to enlighten you on that. I think it is a perfectly proper question, because you must know, since we are talking about large-scale cooperation, so we have to know all about each other, thoroughly, and at first hand as it were, on the basis of first-hand information. We...[changes thought] A little history. This is so important that a little bit of history will be needed. Why is it important? Because now is the time when the vital question of our perestroyka is being decided: the replacement of one economic model by another; the replacement of the command plan system by a regulated market. We have not tackled such issues since October 1917, on this kind of scale. This is the biggest turning point. But it...

[Indistinct whisper, interrupting]

[Gorbachev] I'll talk about that in a minute. But it is precisely this which all in all should determine the face of the future society.

But why right now, rather than earlier or later? I was recently discussing this before our people. When we began perestroyka we thought that just through dynamism, enthusiasm, some programs in the field of scientific and technical progress, we would ensure a speeding up of things, reach different labor productivity and get different results. But the point is that the way things worked out was that the previous economic system rejected scientific and technical progress too. It was completely outlay-oriented; it was not interested in dealing with science and technology. And only in the defense sector, where there were strict provisions for everything, and also in some other industries—whereas in others everything went slowly, like, you know, in a slow-motion film. If in your country the passage from a discovery or invention is a few years, in our country this could take 10, 15, or 20 years. And by then the discovery would lose all (?meaning).

We saw that there were no stimuli for a certain motivation for man's labor. He is assigned the role of an extra. He has to fulfill that which is assigned to him from above. He had no situation where he would have had to think, show initiative, take risks. There was none of this. He was alienated from the process.

And so we see that this is not working out. We have to change management methods. We started to introduce financial autonomy, leasing, self-financing, first at individual enterprises, then in individual industries, ministries, then throughout the economy. But it is not working, it is not producing the necessary results. So what is the matter?

While trying to introduce these new components and forms of new life into the economy, we were retaining the entire superstructure, the entire administration, the old system of administration. And we saw that that was naive, because this system, which had formed over decades, was literally holding everything in a vice-grip. And there could be no initiative, no independence, no decisions, no nothing. Everything was as it had been before. It had the apparatus from top to bottom in its clutches. At that point one had to start dismantling this command system. And that is when political reform was required. The existing command and bureaucracy political system had to be broken. One had to distribute functions and take the party out of it and make it look after its own business, while making Soviets look after their own: In the first place the upper echelon was to deal with the legislation, while other levels...[changes thought] There had to be a division of functions. In this way the political reform was born. Frankly speaking, from that time on the processes accelerated, because in combination with democracy, glasnost, and the dismantling of old mechanisms for governing the society, we were able to open for people the way to real participation in the process. In other words, nothing would have come of it without the political reform.

Nevertheless, the political reform is going in such a way now, and has acquired such dynamics and the processes of politicization in the society have gone so far we cannot keep pace with them. Through the political reform we have created such an atmosphere and released such a force from below that now we are being subjected to most violent, powerful pressure. At times in some regions it sweeps governing structures aside.

Yet we wanted it. On the whole all this is right, despite all the costs. So, now that we have done this, we need to do something else as well. We have destroyed the old system, but the new one has not yet started working, and our vessel has found itself with no anchors and it is being tossed around, and all of us are little by little getting sick.

Therefore, watching this process we can see that if the period of transition from the destroyed old system to a new one is long, then this may cause such instability and such consequences that may disorganize the society. That is why the conclusion was that acceleration and radicalization were needed and the transition to new forms of economy must be tackled sooner. This in fact is the idea and how we have come to it.

Thinking of it we thought we have been through certain experiences and have already got some idea of it. But in fact we do not at all know such a sphere where everything is regulated by the law and economic methods.

We have become accustomed to everything being done according to decisions and instructions. This is all over now. It does not work, it holds back society, it hinders it. It is oppressive for people. So, freedom is a key point of perestroyka—in the political process, in spiritual life, in the choice of a future. There you have it. Everything has been done. Now we have come close to—well, what are the forms? We have seen we must sort out property relations. If everything is to be in the hands of the state, as it was, then we will destroy this system, and there will be nothing. The Law on Ownership has emerged, which in general, if it is implemented,—and we have only made a start on implementing it—then we will arrive at a varied structure for the economy, where there will be the

state sector, and also the cooperative and the collective sector, and where there will be the private sector; all these elements, so to speak. The most important thing is that a process of reducing public ownership will be going on, one of formation of share companies, of lease contracting, of joint production, and so on, and individual free labor activity, entrepreneurship. That is our approach. This is the purpose of the Law on Land. Now a tax law is being discussed; ahead are laws against monopolies, because even in your country there are no monopolies such as we have, we have major and important positions, especially in technology, where one or two or three enterprises might hold sway.

Take the Nikel concern, a nickel concern. It can dictate everything to the country, on its own, everything; it has everything in its hands. So, we need anti-monopoly legislation. We must introduce a competitive basis, and hence we need laws. They are soon to come out, laws on entrepreneurship, on medium-sized and small enterprises, and on their future. We have no developed system of banks, for there is no market, we have no labor markets, nor stock markets, nor commodity markets. That is, at the moment we must create the whole infrastructure for a market. For that reason, there is a whole package. Comrade Maslyukov is heading this work, he is conducting it together with Abalkin. There is a whole package of resolutions, of new laws in the Supreme Soviet. Some of it will be adopted by the government, some by degrees of the president, and some by the Supreme Soviet, to get to work on this expansive area and to complete all the preconditions in the remaining months of this year for starting the transition, beginning in January, to a regulated market economy. Naturally, in encompassing all this, both property relations, and the credit and finance system, and the banks, and the various markets, and so on and so forth, we have naturally come right up against prices, as well, because I do not think such pricing exists anywhere in the world. In our country they reflect nothing—except confusion and the so-called command system, which we operated in the past. They do not reflect real costs. They do not take account of needs, so to speak. They are dictated mainly by producers—those who do not want to develop technically, raise labor productivity, or strive for good quality. All of this has to be ended.

For this reason we will carry out price reform. Why did we set 1 July as a date? Everybody—especially, no doubt, those who are watching things from a distance—has been wondering what is going on. Nothing has been started yet, but suddenly, for some special reason as it were, Gorbachev and the government are persuaded to raise prices suddenly, from 1 July, even though nothing has been done in the way of preparation for a transition to the market.

The issue is bread. Bread is very cheap. In your country good quality bread costs R2—[corrects self] $2 a kilogram. In our country the best quality bread costs only 50 kopecks. Most bread is sold at 20 kopecks—in other words 10 times cheaper than yours. Yet you sell grain and we have to buy it. You sell grain when your prices are that high. We buy grain when our price is so low. There is absolutely no justification for this. Children use loaves of bread as footballs. Bread is thrown about. Bread goes in the garbage dump. Cattle are fed with baked bread. This is quite simply disgraceful. The people themselves are saying that this situation must be rectified.

And there is another thing. We have sufficient bread and bread products in our country, if you count our foreign purchases. We eat 121 kg. Isn't that so?

[Unidentified speaker] Yes.

[Gorbachev] We consume 121 kg of grain per head of population. That is all right. So, this a commodity for which we can confidently create a market. Therefore, we can start sorting things out. The people themselves are prepared for this.

Finally, there is the third quite important point: When 1 January comes around, we will begin introducing elements of a market economy. We will introduce the infrastructure of the market. We will start activating all the mechanisms. We think it will take us between 18 months and two years to introduce these mechanisms during the transitional period. Subsequently the system will be built up. This will take years. But we must set the main market mechanisms going quickly.

And so, on 1 January we shall begin doing this. But we know nothing about how to do it. After all, we haven't lived—we have no experience of working in market conditions, none at all. We have to use this product, bread, to amass experience, since here it is easier, here we have a commodity and we—and in these circumstances we have decided—perhaps it is strange, yesterday when I was explaining this very point to Mr. Baker, he agreed that this is probably right. He said: Why are you compensating everyone? I said: No, who told you we're compensating everyone? For bread, we'll compensate everyone, for the one reason that if we are to remove all the social strain, we have to get these mechanisms to work and get the feel of what the market is and what situation it puts us in and what consequences—proximate, remote, incidental—that it what we need, and so we are accepting the idea of full compensation. We are abolishing the entire bread subsidy we have at present. That bread, why did we (?not do it) sooner? As for the switch to the market in general, of course we are in favor of a market economy, on the basis of a multisystem—of its multisystemic nature. Recognizing various forms, from state forms to private ones. Well, we call it labor ownership [trudovaya sobstvennost], peasant ownership [krestyanskoye khozyaystvo]. There's Academician Shatalin, who thinks that I am not radical enough and that he is more radical, because I say labor ownership, by the peasant, where there is also the means of production. Well, that is private. So be it, let us not... [changes thought] I think this sphere of small traders,

services, peasant farms, the sphere of agriculture—all that will be, as it were, the private sector.

[Unidentified speaker] Joint stock.

[Gorbachev] Joint stock, well, that is already not, that is, I would not call that pure private ownership, when it is a question of joint stock—well, we'll see. We have to get all this going. And so it is a very sharp change of direction. Of course prices frighten people. What can be said about this? We intend to react to this too, above all. As for the rest, it is up to the scientists or the government to sort out how it should be done. Well, that is also, so to speak... [changes thought] Mainly it is the scientists, they must...

[Aleksandr Sergeyevich Dzasokhov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee] Scientists and members of the government.

[Gorbachev] Well, then, what we think, as far as prices are concerned, is that there are some goods where we won't compromise at all. And that has been stated: jewellery, special luxury items, too. These won't affect most people at all. There, we will raise prices. Let those who have bad money, or, let us say, no money to spare, choose. There we will not compensate anything. On other products we especially, primarily, will look at measures of social protection, with regard to pensioners, large families, students, all those who were mentioned. Well, and, naturally, workers. This will, however, be with different approaches and different degrees of compensation. This will be worked out.

Then, of course, it will not be sufficient for us once to increase prices. They may also have a tendency to further increase, especially, when we deregulate an increasing number of prices. At the first stage we will make 15 percent free prices and 25 percent regulated. That is, 40 percent of prices already by next year will be either free or regulated, restricted, within some kind of limits. We will leave only control of foodstuffs, of approximately eight products, and, approximately, slightly more in industry for next year. That is, what directly affects life. We are consciously doing this, not to brake the process, but because our people and society are simply not ready for the conditions of a market economy. They do not even know how to behave. We want to prevent an explosion of inflation, for these reasons

The degree of freedom regarding prices will also expand with the increase, as it were, the implantation and strengthening of market mechanisms.

Generally, we have a great task ahead of us, a very great one. I must mention two aspects. Well, actually, it is one aspect. This is society's unpreparedness for living under market conditions. Much will seem to you to be even funny and surprising. Well, what have those Russians there thought up? But no, it is you, whose whole life has been spent under market conditions, it is surprising to you, but not to us. [laughs] We must undergo all this and modify our minds to it, adapt ourselves to the new situation. You see, it is a completely different economic system.

I have passed this on to the President through your secretary of state and I want also to appeal to you. We count very much on the fact that here we will have mutual understanding and you will find the means to provide us with certain support and provide us with interaction, so that we can interact. I mean that, there seem to be appearing [changes thought] yesterday we said we will set up some kind of Soviet-U.S. think tank of entrepreneurs, our economic experts and academics, so that it operates permanently, as it were, and pursues thoughts and ideas at this stage, when we are deciding things. That is one.

Second, we should, of course, do much for our, our people's awareness. How can you change that? You cannot change it by lecturing. First, they have to be truly involved in these processes, so they acquire habits; there is no other way. We have to change their living conditions, then they will more quickly feel at home with it. Lecturing, however, produces nothing.

Three years ago, already in '87, we—even as early as '86—I said at the congress that we would, we were setting a course for a market, for commodity money relations, with the application of all market instruments. Everything went in one ear and out the other. As soon as we said [word indistinct], that was it, everyone began thinking.

That is esentially what this concerns. That is why something will probably also appear in the congress in connection with this. I hope you understand the fact that we are now making a change to a market, this may be the most powerful change toward turning the whole of the Soviet Union, the whole society, toward civilization and a normal, organic adaptation of measures of economic contacts and the whole complex of international relations. That is why generally speaking this is a true revolution, a true revolution.

Do not be afraid, or else you will also scare us. [laughter]

I recently had a talk with the leadership of TIME magazine. We talked for a long time. I also gave them a lengthy written interview. I do not know if they have published it or not. There was a verbal conversation. We ended our talk, it was very frank, seeing as that is the magazine I single out from other mass media, since it was the first U.S. magazine that interviewed me, so we established some sort of contact. Right, we finished the talk and editor Miller, I think, the editor [indistinct prompting] Muller, asks me—we had finished everything and were standing there just talking—and he says: I am surprised you are so calm. All around you everything is falling apart, but you—how do you account for it? [laughter] Just a minute. Well, we are not engaging in repairs or repainting, we are [changes thought] that is what perestroyka is all about. So everything taking place

around us, even in extreme forms, perestroyka. Otherwise, it would be a sham, not perestroyka. I do not know how sham comes across in American English. [laughter] In any case, it would be a fraud and not perestroyka. So, obviously things will not be easy for us. If we add here that there are also problems in the federation, and the party is searching for its place and role, and the new soviets are still gathering strength, so to speak, on the basis of the rights we have given them, all this will be very complicated. Well, I have tried to give a detailed answer. [laughter] Presumably all this will make interesting reading for you, this will interest you.

On day one, they began to discuss Comrade Ryzhkov's report. Was it two-thirds that spoke in favor of the government's resignation?

[Unidentified man] Fewer.

[Gorbachev] What?

[Several voices] Fewer. No, fewer much fewer. Fifty or so. About fifty.

[Gorbachev] Well, it doesn't matter. They said, resign. On day two they began to take a look at it, to see what's what and why, and there appeared to be first steps towards a meeting halfway, although they were critical of the report, there were a great many reservations. On day three, Sunday, I urgently went on television to say something on this issue. The public went to the shops and everything went. You've been shown this, you have probably already too.

[Voice] It went.

[Gorbachev] It went, that's right. On Monday, there was businesslike discussion, and in all 100 deputies, members of the Supreme Soviet, spoke on this report. On the last day, they dropped the motion on a vote of no confidence in the new government, and agreed with the government to decisively rework the remainder of the program on the basis of that debate, to enrich it and amend it substantially, to make it both radical and realistic, and to work out especially strongly all instruments of social protection in order to provide safety for the people. Now, for one week, the government and committee of the Supreme Soviet are already working on it. They gave themselves a week to work it all out.

So even at the level of the government and the Congress, where, in a sense, the most perceptive people are concentrated, even there there was this kind of reaction. And even more so among the public. All in all, we face much practical work, so that the entire public understands and—[changes thought].

By the way, you spoke about a referendum. Of course we have to form national consent, but we have neither a law on referendums nor have we ever held a single referendum. That is why I put forward a proposal with a view to finding a formula for making known the people's consent and their proposals. It will probably be a discussion in labor collectives, and then through the system of the soviets. After all, these are new soviets that we have just formed, they have only just been elected by the people, they can be trusted completely. And having discussed everything and conveyed their opinions and conclusions, we are in effect, through the representative bodies, through deputies' views, going to have available to us what we really have, the public attitude. Of course, we are not setting ourselves the task of having to get 100 percent, or 90, or 80, but I think we do have to form a national consent. By now the people do not oppose the market, but they want it to be done less painfully. That, essentially, is what it's about.

[Senator Mitchell] Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Dole.

[Dole] Thank you, Mr. President. I think we all agree that a major factor is stability, and that stability is needed in the Soviet Union and in the United States. It is needed to maintain free and open relations. I think it would be fair to say that even as you are subjected to pressure by the population of the Soviet Union, President Bush is also subjected to pressure by many of those present at this table, both Republicans and Democrats, when it comes to specific political issues. That is why it's necessary somehow to react, to respond to this. That is why I think we would like to help. I hope we are working constructively. I remember you telling me in 1987, when I was visiting you, that we in the Congress were adopting too many resolutions. But that's what we've stopped doing recently; that is, we have stopped adopting too many resolutions.

In short, I would like to welcome you also on behalf of my Soviet colleagues [as heard, Dole can be heard to say in English: I would like to obviously welcome all of my colleagues] and tell them that Mr. Primakov was very popular in the State of Maine and the State of Kansas. We gave him the title of Dodge City marshal with full regalia to maintain law and order. [laughter] He coped perfectly well with the task, arresting several people, all Democrats, of course. [laughter]

But there is one question which we ask objectively when it comes to trade. As you discussed in our television appearance, presumably there will be certain questions in Congress regarding the Baltic states—that is, independence for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—when this will be connected with the awarding of most-favored-nation status. This indeed is an important political question. It is neither Republican nor Democratic. It is just such a question, when the President does not recognize these countries, but the President wants to cooperate on this—but do it the right way. Could you shed extra light on this aspect? You have discussed the issue of Middle East hostages with President al-Asad and with Syria. [Dole is heard to say in English: If you can shed any light on that, if you could help us with our hostages by heavy talking with President Asad and Syria] Well, we would like to know, we would be obliged if you could say something about that.

[Gorbachev] We must try to crystallize, so to speak, the most important, the main thing, so that you, representatives of the Senate, people whom I respect and whose opinion I value, well, would really be able to form your opinion on the correct premises. Now, I am not raising the issue that it is our internal matter. After all, we are already discussing, without any complexes, internal [questions], too, both yours and ours. If you form some kind of opinion or have some kind of interest, all the more so, since in the present case, you are linking, well, trade and the Baltic. That already, all the more so, obliges me to operate actively, to operate actively [laughs].

Yes, I considered that the two most serious points have been elaborated thoroughly, as a result of joint efforts. That is, that we have come to this meeting with a certain degree of accord on the 50 percent reduction of weapons and on trade agreements. That, on the whole, you know, it seemed to us that that will be such a boost, not just for our people but for peace, too. Everything that is happening to you and us, it is so important, it has such an effect. Therefore, I hope that this whole complex will be implemented.

But, regarding the Baltic: You know that as the result of some kind of group of individuals, we simply have fallen into—what kind of politicians are they? Musicians, others, and maybe they are not bad musicians—well, into a trap. They have driven themselves into a trap, and us. Well...

[Unidentified speaker, interrupting] Those are the rules of the game.

[Gorbachev] Yes, absolutely, as if realities did not exist for them or for us, the Constitution and so forth. Well, you know, in our country, within the framework of perestroyka, such a situation has arisen whereby we have had to resolve a great many problems connected with the reform of our federation. And the question has arisen there of sovereignty, economic independence, languages, culture, citizenship, and so forth. And all that is being discussed very thoroughly in all the republics. Moreover, in places some distortions and misunderstandings have arisen, even with respect to these particular issues—language, the residence qualification, from what age one can be permitted to vote or to take part in elections. At one time you had that element—a residence qualification—in your Constitution, when I was still studying it. Now it is different, even though it has been somewhat amended.

Some people have said that one must live in a republic for ten years before one receives the right to take part, and even longer to be elected. There were different variants. Issues like this were discussed for a month or two. There were debates in the press. One session was held, then another. There were several readings in the republics. Even so, in some places blunders did occur, and this caused acute reactions among the population. In reality, the country is a mixture of peoples. Dozens of peoples live in each territory. And as soon as some distortions are noted, that is perceived as an outrage against the main thing, on freedom, an encroachment on rights. In the Ukraine, someone raised a question and referred to the Russian language in an unfortunate manner. He had only said it, had not yet proposed anything, and moreover it had not yet been discussed at the session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet. What followed? In the Crimea they immediately started to collect signatures for an appeal to the central government to return the Crimea to the Russian Federation where it had previously belonged. They collected 500,000 signatures. They met in time, cleared it up, said all that was to be said and the process came to a halt.

But the return of Crimea to Russia is not all. Take the Donbass—it consists completely of Russians—all the miners, the metal workers are Russians. There are 11 million of them living in the Ukraine, 11 million of them have been set in motion. You can imagine what that means. Even with respect to particular issues, when they are resolved without being properly thought out, such dangerous phenomena, you understand, emerge, arise.

Suddenly the Supreme Soviet was elected. Moreover, what did they do? They held elections in Lithuania. Part of the constituencies, approximately one-third, had not yet been elected. They did not get a majority in the first round. They should have held the second round two weeks later. But we fixed an extraordinary congress during that period at which we decided to introduce the institution of the Presidency.

The Lithuanians brought forward—countermanded old decisions, moved the elections to two days before the congress, so as to engineer the situation as quickly as possible prior to the congress, and present the whole congress with a fait acompli. They elected, pronounced—and during the night they gathered and voted through secession from the Union. Well, I can tell you, this produced a sharp reaction in the public. It was some kind of conspiracy, an overnight coup. I mean, questions about who should have the right to take part in elections and be elected, and when, are discussed for months. Here they gathered during the night, raised their hands and said we are no longer in the Soviet Union. That's absurd. Eight hundred thousand non-Lithuanians. In 1940, some territory was handed over to Lithuania from Belorussia...

[Unidentified voice, interrupting] Six rayons.

[Gorbachev] Six rayons were handed over by Belorussia to Lithuania. Klaipeda, as a result of war, was, like Kaliningrad Oblast, East Prussia, given to the Soviet Union. Stalin detached Klaipeda...

[Unidentified voice, interrupting] Cut it off from Kaliningrad.

[Gorbachev] ...cut it off from Kaliningrad and gave it to Lithuania, so that it would have access to the coast.

As soon as the Lithuanians voted, that was it; the Belorussians in a few days convened—we asked them not to—their Supreme Soviet and adopted a decision for the return of the Belorussian lands from Lithuania. In Klaipeda there was such unrest, and they adopted resolutions that we, as a result of the war, belonged there, to Russia—we want back. There you are. The Poles raised the issue that they were staying in Russia. Eight hundred thousand non-Lithuanians, what's to be done with them? And what about defense, the Navy, lines of communication, borders? How can anyone do a thing like that?

Mr. Mitchell here asked me in Moscow how were we going to resolve this issue. I said, were this the United States of America, your president would have solved all this in 24 hours; whereas we, within democracy and glasnost, go on talking, persuaded that there is a Constitution, that there is the right to self-determination, and now we have adopted a law on the mechanism of secession. Let's get back to the constitutional process and we will discuss it, and then you can decide, whatever you agree on, whatever you decide, hold a referendum, and that's what we will do. We will put our proposal to your own people, we will put forward our proposal. They don't believe the people will support them. And I am convinced the people won't support them. Where will Lithuania go? It has been side by side with Russia for centuries. It is now oriented toward the Russian market. All of its ties. All the more so now. The level of cooperative economic activity with the country's other republics is up to 50 percent in Lithuania. This is saying nothing of 90 percent of the oil, gas, ore, cotton—all that comes from Russia and the other republics. All the raw materials—all of them. And they even occupy a favorable position, in that they are sitting on the end product and are receiving the best dividends. This whole undertaking, let me tell you, is ill-considered, adventurist and separatist in character. That is why such a situation has arisen. The Third Congress [of USSR People's Deputies] declared all these decisions null and void, and gave the president a mandate to restore a constitutional system. There you have my, my maneuver. The only thing is that, when I recently met with Ryzhkov, and we met with Prunskiene, we said, you know, let us handle it this way: Get out of this situation while saving both your face and ours. Actually, we have the mandate of the Congress, and we won't change it. What the country requires of me as president is very tough. I have been accused. They say: We gave you presidential rights for nothing—you sit there and do not use them, you do nothing. I—for the sake of the principle of perestroyka itself—we want to avoid such measures, associated with severe consequences, we've got to find...[changes thought] We said, very well, the Congress has demanded that all these decisions be rescinded—the act of independence and all that followed. Let us come to an agreement. You can suspend it without rescinding it.

[Unidentified speaker, interrupting] Don't break away.

[Gorbachev] In other words, keep it—you'll more or less save face—but suspend it, and we'll begin negotiations with you. Then we'll have some possibility—you'll return to the old situation, but retain it. You're not satisfied with the negotiations? Good; then decide, and you can withdraw from those negotiations, and bring that act into force again. But let us think! We'll try to use everything—all our possibilities, in order to avoid extreme methods and in order, within the framework of the constitutional process, to solve this whole [word indistinct].

That is the key to approaching the problem with other republics too. Why have the supreme soviets rushed on in the other republics? It is written in their own constitutions that these issues should be solved on a referendum basis. That's what's written in the Latvian Constitution. They violated their own Constitution. They held no referendum. They again voted that they were proclaiming their independence. Why? Because in the Baltics, in Latvia, they not only will not get two-thirds, they will not even get the support of 40 percent for leaving the Soviet Union.

[Unidentified voice] It's a different structure.

[Gorbachev] Absolutely. They have 52 percent non-Latvians there. Well, that's adventurism.

So do bear in mind that for us this is much more difficult than it is for you.

As I said, when I had the final press conference with [French President] Mitterrand, they were asking me questions, and I said: Why don't you ask Mr. Mitterrand why he has required 10 years for resolving the issue of Caledonia, about its secession from France? Why aren't we entitled to demand a normal discussion? [laughter]

That's right. I ought to say that we have large reserves of goodwill. And I ought to say that this is a test for the very policy of perestroyka. That is why we are not simplifying anything. We are hoping that the Congress will understand us, that the Congress will understand us. We wouldn't like—[changes thought] In that case I shall ask the two leaders of the Senate right away, why did you allow your government to invade Panama, a sovereign state, and to act there? Where were you, if you are such enthusiastic supporters of freedom? Why do you have two standards, even three? One standard for France, you don't say anything, everything is fine, (?let it be) 10 years for Caledonia. You brought troops into Panama, into a sovereign state, that's all right, the Congress puts up with it, stays quiet. Whereas we, you see, in our own state, insist on constitutional process, and you come to its defense right away, defend it right away. [laughter] Defending the United States of America right away. So we too are defending the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Fine.

[Mitchell] Well, I would just like to say that, speaking just for myself—others can speak for themselves—I think there is a big difference between these situations, and the fact of the matter is of course that the overwhelming majority of the Panamanian people gratefully

received the U.S. Forces which liberated them. You have expressed your opinion, but I still think you will hardly say the majority of Letts [Latyshi, but Mitchell is heard to say in English: Lithuanian people] do not want independence. You have your opinion, we have ours. I must with all respect disagree with you here. I think a vote in Lithuania would undoubtedly show an overwhelming majority for Lithuanian independence.

[Gorbachev] Fine. Fine. Fine. [Words indistinct] but only in that way, through constitutional processes. Well, and of course I am unable, also with the greatest respect, to agree with your explanations regarding Panama.

[?Shevardnadze] When we send our troops into Afghanistan it was also [words indistinct] [laughter].

[Gorbachev] Good, that issue is clear. The ambassador is reminding me that we have only got ten minutes left. [indistinct talk in background]

[Mitchell] Then rather, since we only have ten minutes to go I would like to give a couple of other members of our group a chance to ask questions and, as in Moscow, let us simply say that on some things we do not quite agree. First let us give the floor to Mr. Gephardt.

[Gephardt] First of all, May I welcome you on behalf of all the members of the House of Representatives. I am standing in for Mr. Foley, though I am not a very good substitute for the speaker, who cannot be here today. I greet you on his behalf and on behalf of the House of Representatives. My question is also on the economy. We understand economic questions are very complex for you. We in the United States, of course, have our own difficulties with the economy. Many of us have taken part in the budget summit meetings between the administration and Congress to solve our problems with the national budget. So we know all about economic difficulties. We also understand that the changes you are bringing about are very difficult, that they will take time. I would like to ask you, what could America do to help you in implementing the reforms you hve initiated? Senator Dole spoke about the Lithuanian question. Yes, it does affect our ability to put through such legislation as, for example, most-favored nation status, a treaty on such status.

The president also, as far as I understand, has demanded or asked that a law should be passed in your country on emigration, on exit from the USSR. I understand that your parliament will soon adopt this legislation. Thus, I would like to ask what the status of this legislation is and what stage it is at and, second, if all these obstacles are removed—I hope that this will happen—what do you believe we could do to really expand trade relations between our countries?

[Gorbachev] Well, anyway, I would first ask you to treat our sovereignty with respect, so that issues are not dealt with at congress on what we should do and what laws to take. I think there are solid foundations for my putting it this way. We have entered on the path of democratization. We are developing a society in the direction of peace, it is changing a great deal. When it is reported here, that there is a debate in congress, or that there are demands that we should adopt one law or another, then this is received negatively in our society; you should know this. Because if we start teaching you what you are to adopt in congress, we will go too far. This is all very serious, this affects the most fundamental questions, respectfulness, prestige, sovereignty, national dignity. So, you be punctilious, this is my wish. That is the first thing. Nevertheless, to reply to your questions, as concerns the Baltic, I have already told you. As concerns the law on exits, it has been through its first reading with us...

[Unidentified speaker, interrupting] In practice its provisions are in force, it has now been distributed in its final variant (?to members of the Supreme Soviet).

[Gorbachev] Yes, but indeed, if we are to take the realities, then we have a stream of people leaving. In practice, there are minor obstacles and restrictions, but it is proceeding, and you know, there are figures, there are no problems. In actual fact no one raises this problem any more. You have probably decided, so to speak, to pick on something so as to hold something else up here, I do not know where this is going. I would put it like this, that a gesture on the part of the United States, and Congress, in terms of relations...[changes thought] A trade agreement, this would be very important, very important, even greater politically, because, in general, nothing will change rapidly at the present time. Our ties are so disordered, they are of a primitive nature, that nothing will change rapidly yet, but they would open up the possibility of realizing what our business people want, both yours and ours. In general they are already tired of nudging you and us, when will we leave behind these anachronisms of the cold war. In general all of this, the entire process of improving our relations seems to be something abnormal, and faltering, if we, two mighty states, cannot attain this and give some kind of example of this. So, this would, for the moment, be of greater political effect. If one is to speak about something else, then at the present time we are posing the question of entering a stage of changes when we will have an intensive market. We are reckoning on the conclusion of some kind of financial deal, let's say an agreement, which would give us the opportunity to do an about turn in these 18 months to two years, these five years. That is, we are reckoning on some kind of credit which we would start to pay back somewhat later. And that would open up possibilities—not simply credit, not simply money to the winds, but rather credit to finance the joint activity of our entrepreneurs. And they have interesting plans, above all concerning the development of the production of consumer goods. That would work for the market. That is the most important thing.

That idea we [words indistinct, Gorbachev seems to be interrupted] We are, for example, highly open to the modernization of the defense sector. There are comrades

present here who are connected with it and are very familiar with it, and will confirm that some West German firms, for example, have already set about concluding some agreements. In this sector there are good reserves, engineers that are, so to speak, highly qualified, professional working cadres. Since they can make the same kind of defense installations as there are in the United States, in most areas at least, then in the civilian sphere they can master any production process.

I visited the Urals. I have spoken about it. You have probably heard about it. There I happened to come across Phillips, who have already, so to speak, concluded a good agreement with our instrument-making factory. In two years time they will start producting consumer durables which will go onto a large market. Therefore, if a trade agreement were to be adopted, it would remove all these things, and we would start the process of working actively. Business people from the United States have now become very active.

Congress has eliminated some of its positions with regard to COCOM [Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls]. This has also opened things up. There are some projects appearing in outline. You understand that things can be done. We have good capacities in aviation, in the aviation industry. We could take the manufacture of an aircraft. Your firm is prepared to cooperate and it has, I think, also received the consent of Congress with respect to the engines and the onboard equipment, and Israel is prepared to fit out the saloon. We could start the joint production and output of a splendid modern airliner which is needed on the world market. Now that would be...

[Ryzhkov, interrupting] [words indistinct]

[Gorbachev] What? That would be action. We have here Academician Yuriy Alekseyevich Ryzhkov, director-rector of an aviation institute, and he is here as a deputy, and there is one more thing that is going on. I mean that we have achieved cooperation in the area of computers...

[Ryzhkov, interrupting] With IBM.

[Gorbachev] ...with IBM. That's interesting. Applications in the field of education. It may develop into an interesting program, an enormous market might open up.

You see, now things might even work out as follows. Regarding our main direction, and with all the importance of all our contacts on the platform of international relations, Soviet-U.S. relations need to be cemented through the economy. And that is why here we need real steps today. If these are not there, if the United States falls behind, others will get going and somehow a situation of some discomfort, for us as well, will arise. And we need, we cannot wait for the Congress—and above all its leaders—to be fully ripe for it. Today much is being held up by the Congress, that's what our data says to us. And I would ask you to give this some thought. This is all very...

[Primakov, interrupting] After all, you gave back most-favored-nation status to China after the events in the square in Beijing. What do we have to do to get most-favored status?

[Gorbachev] Perhaps we should introduce presidential rule in the Baltics and at least fire some blanks in the air?

[Mitchell] Well, let me respond to that. We have not yet given China most-favored-nation status. Although the President is recommending this, many of us oppose it, and they use precisely the argument you cited. [laughter] So perhaps it would be better to discuss this with the President. Now, Mr. Michel, member of the House of Representatives, go ahead please.

[Michel] I shall be very brief. I am one of those who talked to you five years ago, with Speaker O'Neill. And even then it was clear that you were looking far ahead, that you had far-reaching aims. Since then you have come a long way. We applaud you, thank you for your persistence, for everything you have managed to do, and we wish you success in overcoming all the problems you outlined for us today.

I think I have one question. I understand we are practically out of time.

The Middle East. That's one more destabilizing region, and the question is whether you can in any way assist us in the solution of this problem, if you are somehow able to assist us in the solution of this problem, if you are somehow able to assist in the solution of this Middle East problem? I also have here a letter signed by our entire leadership which I would just like to pass onto you. [video shows Mitchell passing letters to Gorbachev]

[Gorbachev] I once said the following to [former Secretary of State] George Shultz, when he came up with the well-known Shultz plan for the Middle East. He came to Moscow and we started to discuss the plan, and it came to how we were to cooperate. I said: First and foremost I welcome your asking to discuss the plan. So far you had thought that you would solve everything there without the Soviet Union. Now you have learned that that will not be so. As far as cooperation goes, we are prepared to do it constructively, using all our influence. And that, after all, is significant.

That is why I shall reply to your question practically with the same words I used then. We are prepared to cooperate with you in a very constructive way. We are already doing so, proceeding from the fact that our ministers are permanently involved in exchanges.

[Dzasokhov] [words indistinct] about agenda.

[Gorbachev] It is permanently on their agenda. We are prepared to act in order to make use of both your possibilities and ours, and somehow, first of all, to stop this process, since now it has intensified, and also to search for more, to attempt to search for a solution. But frankly I can see no other solution than to internationalize this process, the entire discussion and its solution.

The beginning of this process would enable us to take the step we are ready to take—to restore diplomatic relations with Israel. That would also open up opportunities.

We are prepared to act with you as guarantors of the independence and security of the state of Israel, of all the states, including the state of Israel.

I think you are intending somehow to establish contacts and start talks with the Palestinian Liberation Organization. You know, I should say that we may have complexes, and perhaps they are justified by something. But that is not the point, I think that 'Arafat is a figure with whom today one can conduct processes geared to a settlement. Today his position makes this possible. That is what I think. And if you have an opportunity to cooperate with and influence (?him), that would be even more (?helpful).

In short, we will think about everything you said, and I think we will still be talking with the President, but you may count on our constructive approach. I think we have to untangle this knot, which is very dangerous, very dangerous. We have been placed in a difficult position by the Government of Israel. We, on the one hand, let...

[Dzasokhov] We've democratized [word indistinct].

[Gorbachev] ...We've democratized emigration, people go there, and they send them out, and that provokes, so to speak, puts us at loggerheads with all the Arabs. All the presidents have made demarches against us. I think it is being done on purpose, to drive this issue in, to aggravate it.

Thank you for the meeting. I was happy to [words indistinct].

[Mitchell] Thank you, Mr President. We appreciate this meeting. We wish you good and successful work with President Bush.

[Gorbachev] Thank you very much.

Shevardnadze Notes 'Good' Relations

LD0106191490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1810 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Report by TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Washington, 1 Jun (TASS)—The third meeting between the Soviet president and G. Bush began at the White House at noon local time, immediately after M.S. Gorbachev's conversation with representatives of the U.S. Congress, which was held at the Soviet Embassy. The meeting at the White House was attended on the Soviet side by E.A. Shevardnadze, Y.D. Maslyukov, A.A. Bessmertnykh, A.S. Chernyayev, S.A. Akhromeyev, and V.M. Falin.

In an interview with a TASS correspondent about the course of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations, Soviet Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze commented:

On the whole, I think a good start has been made. Very important problems are being discussed. There is no longer any doubt that the visit will culminate in the achievement of solid results. In the sphere of disarmament the basic provisions of a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive armaments have been agreed upon. An agreement on the destruction of the main stocks of chemical weapons will be signed. As far as nuclear tests and the nonproliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons and nuclear technology are concerned, everything has been agreed on. The fine touches are now being put on the draft of a joint declaration on future talks on strategic offensive armaments at the next stage. We are also discussing the whole range of bilateral relations: shipping, air communications, and joint oceanic research. Something on space is also taking shape. As far as trade is concerned, work is still in progress.

I would say that the foundations were laid at the Malta summit. The meeting there was, on the whole, a conceptual one, providing the framework, so to speak, for our relations at the contemporary stage. The realization of everything which was agreed on is now in progress.

The atmosphere at the talks is good. U.S. journalists asked me about that yesterday. I repeat: A good and friendly relationship has been established between the presidents. This is a very important component of contemporary politics. The relationship between the presidents is good, friendly, and trusting, and this is a very important component of present-day politics.

Gorbachev Receives Peace Awards

LD0206011890 Moscow TASS in English 0114 GMT 2 May 90

[Text] Washington June 2 TASS—The Franklin Roosevelt Medal of Freedom and several prizes of American public organisations were conferred on President Gorbachev in Washington on Friday in recognition of his personal contribution to the cause of peace.

Receiving the awards, Gorbachev said that he was accepting them with a feeling of gratitude and responsibility.

"You may be sure that we in the Soviet Union have realised our role and responsibility in the contemporary world. Our people will not bend under the burden of this responsibility and will do everything to justify the hopes that all of us are linking with perestroyka and the new thinking," Gorbachev said.

Gorbachev, Bush Sign Agreements

LD0206031290 Moscow TASS in English 0308 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] Washington June 2 TASS—"We're about to sign agreements concerning many areas of vital interest to our countries and to the world," U.S. President George Bush said at the signing ceremony on Friday.

He emphasised that much of the agenda agreed upon off the island nation of Malta had been completed for this week's summit. "We've made great progress in the last six months and in the last two days."

Bush mentioned particularly a bilateral agreement on chemical weapons "that will for the first time eliminate the great majority of the chemical weapons that our countries have stockpiled over the years."

"And let this landmark agreement quickly lead to a global ban on chemical weapons." Bush said.

Other documents signed at the White House included:
—Protocols to the Soviet-American Threshold Test Ban Treat (1974) and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty (1976) which provide for "unprecedented improvements" for their on-site verification,
—A new agreement that updates and expands the 1973 agreement on the peacefull uses of atomic energy,
—A Soviet-American trade agreement,
—A joint statement recording major agreed provisions of a Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty as well as a joint statement on future nuclear and space arms negotions.

President Bush also mentioned a statement of the conventional armed forces in Europe [CFE] which commits the sides to intensify the pace of the Vienna negotiations and to reach rapid agreement on all outstanding issues. "We agree that a CFF treaty is an indispensable foundation for the future of European security," Bush said.

The sides also signed an agreement to establish a U.S.-Soviet park across the Bering Strait, that will preserve the unique, natural environmental and cultural heritage of the Bering Sea. region of Alaska and Siberia, and an agreement on student exchanges.

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze also signed agreements concerning maritime boundaries, ocean studies, civil aviation, maritime transport and long-term grains agreement.

Bush said he was very gratified by what he and Gorbachev had accomplished over the last few days and was determined to build on this solid foundation. He urged Gorbachev "to make new strides to build a relationship of enduring cooperation."

President Mikhail Gorbachev described the signing of the Soviet-American agreements as "an event of momentous importance, not only for our two countries but the world."

"We do not just declare our commitment to moving toward a healthier international environment, toward better international relations, toward a non-violent world."

Gorbachev said that the agreements signed during the visit were a confirmation that justifying the hopes of peoples the Soviet Union and the United States are also taking practical steps.

"The important steps that we are taking today illustrate the degree of agreement between our two countries, despite the fact that there are things on which we disagree. But that area of disagreement is being narrowed in the course of our work together," he emphasised.

Gorbachev also said that the agreements and documents that were signed were the best demonstration of the two countries' readiness to participate at the level of their responsibility in building a new civilisation.

"There are still many difficult challenges awaiting us. It is evident that to dismantle that monumental artifact of the cold war, the accumulated arsenals of mutual destruction, is not at all a simple or even an entirely safe thing to do. The slightest imbalance, undue haste, or lack of equilibrium in this process may dangerously destabilise the overall international situation," Gorbachev went on to say.

"But I am sure that if we take a balanced and responsible approach, if we take into account the concerns and positions of each other even when we disagree, if we do all that, I am sure that we will be able to move ahead more resolutely and more vigorously."

Speaking about the Malta summit, Gorbachev said that he was pleased to note that the turbulent developments of recent months after Malta have not led the two leaders astray from the goal they set together. "I believe that we have passed the first test."

"Let me reaffirm to both our peoples that the Soviet Union is committed to the objective set at Malta, completing before the end of this year, the preparation of the START Treaty. I believe that this goal is obtainable even though it is difficult."

Gorbachev also confirmed that during the current summit he and President Bush had agreed to do everything to seek a treaty and accords at the Vienna talks. "I mean that a European security meeting will take place this year. Anyway I think we already have good results and a good potential to work," Gorbachev said.

"I believe that this is all possible as a result of the efforts of both sides over the past few years, including the efforts in which you, sir, have participated vigorously and actively and with great foresight in order to expand our relations and to build on the capital of trust in our relations," Gorbachev concluded.

Gorbachev Speaks at Ceremony

LD0206141390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Speech by President Mikhail Sergeyvich Gorbachev at ceremony to sign U.S.-USSR agreements in Washington on 1 June—recorded]

[Text] Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen, Comrades, first of all, I want to thank President George Bush for

representing so splendidly the results of our work in all these previous months, and now here in Washington. I am even in difficulty as to about what I should speak. Probably, I want to think aloud a little in connection with this. In my view this is an occasion at which it can be said that, perhaps, many events have taken place in this hall, many agreements have been announced, but what is happening at the present time and what you spoke about, representing the result of our joint work—this I classify among events of immense importance, not only for our two countries and our peoples but, for the entire world as well.

Mr. Franklin Roosevelt spoke half a century ago about the world of the future in which the four freedoms would triumph: the freedom of speech, the freedom of conscience, the freedom from need, and the freedom from fear. This ideal has not yet been achieved in a single country. It could not have been achieved in a world of enmity and confrontation. That is why the liberation of mankind from fear is bringing us closer to an new world. We are taking these first steps in this direction, pooling our efforts. I mean first of all the efforts of two great peoples and of two mighty states, which the United States and the Soviet Union are.

Perhaps it is extremely important that we are not only declaring our commitment to firmly embarking on the road of improving international relations and to arriving at a nonviolent world, but that we are (also) taking practical steps. And what you mentioned, enumerating everything that will be signed here now, or during this visit, is a confirmation of the fact that we are not only proclaiming our declaration in the direction required so as to realize the expectations of the peoples, and not only in our countries, but that we are also backing these declarations with practical steps. Today, great strides are being made in this direction. This is a great achievement and an illustration of the great degree of agreement between our two states and governments, despite the fact—and I fully agree with you—that many stances and views still divide us. But these differences are becoming fewer and fewer along the path of our joint movement, in our joint work.

What we have agreed and what we shall sign are perhaps the most convincing arguments in favor of our readiness to take part at the level of our responsibility in the construction of a new civilization.

Many difficult matters are still awaiting us.

Obviously, the dismantling of such an immense monument of the cold war as the potential for mutual destruction that has now been accumulated is by no means a simple undertaking, or even a safe one. The least deviation, undue haste, or lack of balance in its dismantling could lead to a dangerous destabilization of the entire international situation. Conversely, if we are careful and responsible, take account of each other's concerns, and are attentive to each other's views—even when we disagree—I am confident that, if these conditions are observed, we shall be able to move ahead more resolutely and vigorously.

You mentioned Malta, Mr. President. I am pleased to confirm the fact that the turbulent events in the months that have elapsed since our Malta meeting have not diverted us from the goal that we jointly set. I consider that we have passed the first tests.

I have told you during our private conversations—of which there have been many on this occasion, and I welcome this style in our talks—but I wish also to confirm in front of those taking part in this gathering and in front of our peoples the loyalty of the Soviet Union to the course that was adopted in Malta this year completing the preparation of a treaty on reducing strategic and offensive arms. I think that, although this is indeed a difficult goal, it is achievable.

I confirm your statement that at this summit meeting we have agreed to do everything and act so as to arrive at the signing of a treaty and agreements at the Vienna talks. I have in mind the fact that in this event there will be an all-European summit.

At any rate we do have results and we do have solid groundwork. I am sure that this has become possible as a result of the efforts over recent years which include your own active, energetic, and farsighted participation in developing dialogue, in building it up, and in preserving, strengthening, and increasing the capital of trust and cooperation.

I shall stop now. It seems I have said even more than I wanted to say, but this is merely to say that I am a human being who is not without emotion. I want to congratulate our peoples on the fact that this has occurred, and regarding this shake your hand as a mark of our cooperation. [applause]

Gorbachev Speaks at Dinner 1 Jun

LD0206112190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Speech by USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at a dinner in honor of President Bush at USSR Embassy in Washington on 1 June—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed Mr. President, Esteemed Mrs. Bush, Ladies and Gentlemen, Comrades,

The second full day of talks has come to an end. However, I do not wish to summarize them. The present meeting is a major one, but it is, nevertheless, just a stage in the vast, future-orientated restructuring of Soviet-American relations. In this year alone, President Bush and I are to meet again on two occasions—at the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, where a treaty on the reduction of conventional weapons in Europe will, I hope, be signed, and, once more, in order to sign a treaty on the reduction of strategic

offensive weapons. I take as my starting-point the view that the agenda that was agreed upon in Malta for 1990 can be realized. But only by constantly raising the bar [as in a high-jump competition, podnimaya planku] can one ensure the climb along the road of new Soviet-U.S. relations, freeing ourselves of everything that was long nourished by the ideology and geopolitics of the cold war period.

Assessing the results of the talks that have taken place, one can, I think, say that they have demonstrated a further strengthening of mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States, and hence an advance along the main direction of the deep, positive changes that have unfolded in the world. Regarding this, the in-depth discussion of the problems of, and prospects for, the European process has undoubedly been useful. It has clarified views and positions, and has adduced new arguments for the pondering of, and search for, suitable solutions.

Naturally, in connection with this, the external aspects of the reunification of Germany were the center of attention. As we understand it, two processes must be accomplished—the final settlement of the results of the war and the solution of internal questions on the transformation of the two parts of Germany into a single state. It seems to us that this does, in fact, form the content of the transitional period, the end of which will mean that the rights of the four victorious powers—which arose, incidentally, not through the division of Germany, but directly according to the results of the war—will lapse and that a new, sovereign state will appear.

At the same time, we proceed from the view that the discussion is not over. It is continuing. There may be several versions [of a solution] rather than just one. They are all subject to joint consideration, to include the participation of allies. As we understand it, ultimately, what is suitable is a version that is jointly found and one that will not damage anyone's interests; that will not undermine the general process of positive changes in Europe and the world. They constitute the principal gain of recent years, the main result and achievment of the growing trust and increasingly greater awareness of the unity of civilization.

A most important result of the present summit is the series of agreements signed today and the official statement that was made. They demonstrate that our joint line to change over from constructive mutual understanding to constructive interaction is yielding fruit. Of course, all this has become possible—and I would say today provides confirmation of this—in the atmosphere which was created at the meeting with President George Bush in Malta.

Required of the United States and the Soviet Union was a substantial, and I would say, courageous reassessment of views of one another and of the world as a whole, a realization of the unnaturalness of isolation from one another, a recognition of mutual responsibility to the world. It is not by chance that reflected in the agreements is a readiness toward more mutual dependence through contacts, mutual familiarization, and cooperation in vitally important areas, toward expanding the legal-treaty base of Soviet-U.S. relations. The package of new agreements also reflects the specific role of the Soviet Union and the United States of America in establishing bridges of mutual understanding and trust between East and West.

I want to single out the agreement on trade. Concluded at the moment of a most profound turnaround in the Soviet economy, on which the fate of the whole of perestroyka depends, it assumes a special meaning, and I am convinced that the very fact that the United States, that the President of the United States of America, has gone for a normalization of trade relations precisely at a moment so crucial for our country will be rightly appreciated by the Soviet people. So then, what has been achieved has been recorded. There are guidelines for further happenings.

I want to express the hope that the ship of Soviet-U.S. relations will continue following the planned course. Understandably, differences remain as to the optimum design of our relations. However, this sphere is narrowing, and the sphere of agreement and cooperation is widening. An indicator of the sincerity and seriousness of our countries' intentions is the difficult revision which was nevertheless started by us, of seemingly eternal ideas of the importance of military force for national security. Accomplishing a radical change in the understanding of security, we must not forget people who were ahead of their age. Among them is Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov, one of the fathers of the nuclear superweapon. Sakharov found in himself the strength to realize and defend to the very end the convictions at which he had arrived. Force has exhausted its role in interstate relations. Sakharov taught us another lesson, too: One must not be timid in the face of dogma, one must not be afraid of looking naive. Political solutions which really meet people's innermost intersts must emanate from life and not from formulae.

Today, our society is going through the complicated, sometimes dramatic, but at the same time promising process of perestroyka on a democratic, humane basis—with human rights and freedoms being fully respected.

Perestroyka is also contributing toward the creation of a new world. After all, we are seeking answers to questions that, in one form or another, with greater or less acuteness, face all people and mankind as a whole. We consider that, passing through the thorns along the chosen path, we shall not only reach new bounds in our own history, but will also help in the building of a new peaceful civilization. We are ready to do that, together with the United States of America.

China

Military Delegation Holds Talks in PRC

LD0106185690 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] A Soviet military delegation is now in Beijing. This is a return visit. A recent guest of Moscow was the chief of the Department of External Relations of the People's Liberation Army of China. Rear Admiral Vladimir Khuzhokov, the head of the Soviet delegation, told that to Radio Moscow reporter before departing from Moscow. Here is the interview:

[Begin Khuzhokov recording in Russian with superimposed English report] The purpose of the visit, said Rear Admiral Vladimir Khuzhokov, is to make another step on the way of establishing regular contacts between the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union and the People's Liberation Army of China. I must say that our military contacts are somewhat lagging behind. They are definitely behind the big progress which has begun in other fields of relations between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

Exchange of official military delegations should be followed by regular contacts between the Armed Forces of the two countries. These will be contacts similar to those the Soviet Union already has with many armies, including those in the West. There will probably be visits by warships, exchange of academy and military school cadets, and trips by military journalists, athletes, and many other events. In other words, military contacts will be full-blooded, so to say, said Rear Admiral Vladimir Khuzhokov. [end recording]

[Announcer] But are they so very necessary. After all, both the Soviet Union and China have been doing without them for 30 years. Rear Admiral Khuzhokov:

[Begin Khuzhokov recording in Russian with superimposed English report] Military contacts have become a major instrument of the foreign policy of the countries, said Rear Admiral Khuzhokov. Without them it is hard to speak about normalizing relations between countries and establishing mutual trust. There can be plenty of calls for peace but until the military come into contact with each other and believe each other it is hard to expect stable peace. Both we and the Chinese comrades are well aware of the fact that contacts between military men are of great importance for building up confidence among countries on the whole, said Rear Admiral Vladimir Khuzhokov in conclusion. [end recording]

Khuzhokov Interviewed on Visit

OW0206085090 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Interview by station reporter (Kuznov) with Rear Admiral Vladimir Zhankhovich Khuzhokov, head of a Soviet military delegation to China]

[Text] A Soviet military delegation is visiting Beijing. Before departure Rear Admiral Khuzhokov, who is the head of the delegation, granted an interview to our station reporter (Kuznov). According to him, this visit is in return for a recent visit by the director of the Foreign Affairs Bureau of the Chinese People's Liberation Army [PLA].

[Khuzhokov heard briefly in Russian fading into Mandarin translation by the announcer] Khuzhokov says: Our visit is another step forward in establishing regular contacts between the Soviet Armed Forces and the Chinese PLA. The military relations between the two countries are somewhat (?stagnant), conspicuously lagging behind the great advances in other aspects of the bilateral relations.

Khuzhokov believes that following the exchange of visits by the military delegations of the two countries, representatives of the Armed Forces of the two countries should begin regular contacts, such as those between the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union and other countries, including the Western nations. The two countries may also exchange port calls by military vessels, as well as visits by military academy cadets, military correspondents, and military (?sportsmen). In short, military contacts between the two countries should be comprehensive.

However, are such military contacts necessary? Didn't the Soviet Union and China get by without such contacts for three decades?

[Khuzhokov heard briefly in Russian fading into Mandarin translation by the announcer] Khuzhokov says: Military contacts are a very important means of a country's foreign policy. Without such ties, it is difficult to talk about the normalization of relations between two countries and the establishment of mutual trust. In spite of loud appeals for peace, without contacts and trust between military men, it will be hard to imagine world stability.

In conclusion, Khuzhokov stresses: Both we and our Chinese comrades believe that contacts between military men are of great significance for consolidating mutual trust between the two states.

PRC Military Official Meets With Belousov

OW0306083690 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] General Liu Huaqing, vice chairman of the PRC Central Military Commission and of the Military Commission of the CPC Central Committee, who is now visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet Government, met with Comrade Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, on 1 June. The visit is being carried out in the spirit of promoting friendly contacts between leaders of the military departments of the two countries to enhance mutual understanding.

Liu Huaqing visited Lenin's former residence at the Kremlin Palace, laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier outside the palace walls, and toured an Air Force museum in (Munino) City on the outskirts of Moscow on 1 June. The itinerary of the delegation led by Liu Huaqing also includes visits to Leningrad, [place-name indistinct], the cosmonauts training center in the vicinity of Moscow, and Baykonur Space Launching Ground. The delegation also will meet with Soviet leaders from various circles.

Ministry Official Discusses Trade With PRC

OW0306132890 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0200 GMT 23 May 90

[Announcer-read talk by (Lukov), official of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations]

[Text] Listeners: Several economic agreements were signed between the Soviet Union and the PRC during Chinese Premier Li Peng's recent visit. Commenting on this matter, (Lukov), an official of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, said:

The Chinese premier's visit to the Soviet Union had great significance for the development of economic relations and trade between the two countries. The documents signed by the two sides laid a foundation for the development of bilateral ties in the years to come. Undoubtedly, the program of cooperation between the two countries in economic, trade, and scientific-technological fields up until the year 2000 is the most important document signed. The document provides for the general direction of bilateral relations and the direction of long-term cooperation. Trade is the principal form of cooperation between the two sides. However, the content of bilateral trade has undergone changes. Accordingly, the question of payment, a key element in the bilateral trade, was placed on the agenda. Both sides agreed that the method of payment used all these years had become obsolete and was a real obstacle to the development of economic relations and trade between the two countries. Thus, they agreed to initiate a transition to the method of payment by foreign exchanges [zi you dui huan wai hui de fang fa]. This would give both sides a freer hand in trade and increase the category and variety of export commodities and bring benefits to producers of export goods in both countries.

(Lukov) continued: If the two countries can successfully develop their trade on this new foundation, the volume of their two-way trade can be expected to reach from $7 billion to $10 billion a year by the end of this century. In contrast, the two-way trade was only $3.3 billion last year. Something should be pointed out here. That is, certain difficulties may crop up. It is important to know that foreign exchange is needed for payment. Accordingly, the two sides will have to keep their bilateral trade at a certain level in the framework of their overall trade. However, there is no reason to be pessimistic about this. We feel that both the Soviet Union and China possess great potential for developing their trade under the new conditions. Besides, we are not effecting an overnight transition to the method of payment by foreign exchange. This method, when implemented, will be restricted only to a number of areas of trade at the beginning.

(Lukov) said: It should be pointed out that trade is only one element of the long-term program of cooperation signed during Premier Li's visit. I would like to point to several areas that have the brightest prospects in the economic and scientific-technological cooperation between the two sides. They are electric power, metallurgy, heavy industry, communications, housing construction, and infrastructure. In the scientific field, the two countries can expand cooperation in space research, bioengineering, genetic engineering, nuclear physics, and agricultural technology. The new phase of bilateral relations also requires the application of new principles in organizing scientific-technological cooperation. I feel that we should set up departmental and regional associations for cooperation, cooperative enterprises, joint laboratories for specialized research projects, and joint databanks. To sum up our discussion, we can say that the foundation has been laid and the question now is to starting working.

Pugo-Led Delegation Continues PRC Visit

Sees Qiao Shi in Beijing

PM3105143590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "In a Businesslike Atmosphere"]

[Text] Beijing, 30 May—A CPSU delegation headed by B.K. Pugo, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, which is visiting the PRC, was received today by Qiao Shi, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo Standing Committee and secretary of the CPC Central Discipline Inspection Commission.

During a businesslike, friendly conversation the sides briefed one another on the progress of perestroyka in the Soviet Union and reforms in China and exchanged opinions on the ways to renew and improve socialism in the interests of improving the life of the working people. They discussed questions of further developing interstate and interparty ties, including exchanging experience of the work of CPSU and CPC control and disciplinary organs.

During the conversation they expressed satisfaction at the ongoing development of comprehensive ties between the two countries and parties on the basis of the principles coordinated during last year's Soviet-Chinese summit meeting. The sides agreed in the opinion that friendly relations and mutually beneficial cooperation between the USSR and the PRC, between the CPSU and the CPC accord with the fundamental interests of the two countries' peoples and promote the cause of peace.

Pugo Discusses Visit

LD0106115890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Corresondent V. Kulikov reports on the visit to China by a CPSU delegation led by Boris Karlovich Pugo, chairman of the Party Control Committee at the CPSU Central Committee; from "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The delegation acquainted itself with the activity of the the control and discipline bodies of the Chinese Communist Party [CCP] regarding conditions of reforms and the expansion of its external ties. The importance of the exchange of experience between the two parties was noted in talks held at the government's Diaoyutai residence in Beijing and at meetings with Chinese Communists which took place in Shanghai, Guangzhou, and Shenzhen. Before leaving for home, the CPSU delegation was received by Comrade Qiao Shi, member of the Standing Committee of the Politburo of the CCP Central Committee and secretary of its Discipine Inspection Commission. [video shows Pugo and delegation in talks with Chinese counterparts]

[Pugo] The conversations and meetings showed that our relations have not yet reached their apogee today. In other words, there are opportunities for further improving them. All the same, we must proceed from the premise that our two very large countries have frontiers stretching an enormous distance and many common interests, and today it is clear that cooperation can develop and be significantly more effective than it has been before now. Our side is displaying such a desire, and we felt an identical aspiration from the Chinese side as well. [video shows Pugo and Kulikov in conversation on a sofa]

Pugo Reviews Visit, Departs

OW0306133490 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0600 GMT 2 Jun 90

[From the "Asian Affairs" program]

[Text] The CPSU delegation led by Boris Karlovich Pugo, candidate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Party Control Committee, has returned to the motherland from Beijing. On the eve of his departure from Beijing, Pugo said: Our visit to China has enabled us not only to understand the work of enterprises in Beijing, but also has taken us to south China, including Guangzhou, the Shenzhen Special Economic Zone, and Shanghai. We have had many opportunities to meet with workers of party committees and party organizations. We now have some idea of the issues in which the Chinese Communists and working people are currently taking a primary interest. I would like to point out a few principal points in this regard.

First, in the past year, our cooperation has entered a stage at which we actually are implementing agreements that were reached at the Soviet-Chinese summit in Beijing in May 1989. China is carrying out interesting tasks. For instance, China now has a total of nearly 20,000 joint ventures. We visited some [word indistinct] enterprises. Joint enterprises have offered employment opportunities to a very large number of residents. They have built plants producing high-quality products, which are selling well in the world market. These products have entered markets as far away as Europe, North America, and Japan. A large part of these products are exported to the Soviet Union. We believe that Soviet-Chinese joint ventures can be organized in all trades, although joint ventures engaging in the mass production of consumer goods are most feasible.

Second, the ties between our two countries and our two parties are far from realizing their maximum potential. Extensive possibilities and potential still exist for our two countries to further develop and improve these ties. Both sides have expressed a willingness to realize these possibilities and potential.

Northeast Asia

KCNA Cited on Consequences of ROK Summit

SK0106142690 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] According to an AFP report, KCNA has said that a meeting between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and ROK President No Tae-u, which is anticipated to be held in San Francisco on 4 June, will bring about grave political consequences and create obstacles on the path to Korea's reunification.

Sometime ago, Japan's KYODO news agency, quoting a source from Seoul, reported on the possibility of a meeting between the presidents of the two countries.

Moscow Radio has no other information concerning this.

Seoul Cited on No Tae-u-Gorbachev Meeting

SK0406002790 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 2 Jun 90

[From the "Asian News" program under the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] In a press conference in Washington, White House Press Secretary Marlin Fitzwater said that talks between U.S. President Bush and ROK President No Tae-u will be held.

As was indicated by a government statement published in Seoul sometime ago, the ROK president will arrive in the United States to meet with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. This will be the first meeting between the heads of the two states that have no diplomatic relations.

On the other hand, Arkadiy Maslennikov, press secretary of the Soviet president, refused to comment on the report of the possibility of a meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and No Tae-u.

The statement of the ROK Government said that the meeting between the presidents of the Soviet Union and ROK will be held on 4 June in San Francisco.

DPRK Proposes Disarmament for Peace in Korea

SK0406064990 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] The Central People's Committee, the Standing Committee of the Supreme People's Assembly, and the State Administration Council of the DPRK put forward a disarmament proposal for peace on the Korean peninsula.

The document read in a press conference in Pyongyang pointed out that confrontation and war are beneficial neither to the North nor to the South.

The DPRK proposed that all joint military exercises and military maneuvers with foreign troops be suspended. It also proposed that all military personnel be withdrawn from the demarcation line and Armed Forces be reduced to 100,000 each in three or four years, and that the Korean peninsula be turned into a nuclear-free zone.

'New Climate' Seen in No Tae-u Visit to Japan

OW0206133990 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 29 May 90

[Announcer-read commentary by Dmitriyev]

[Text] In view of statements issued by Japan and South Korea, the major achievement of the Japan-South Korea summit meeting seems to be the creation of a new climate for developing relations between the two countries based on a new foundation free of the so-called bitter hangover of the past. I have a feeling that following the European situation, Asia has begun to work on the creation of a new post-war international order. In creating such a new order, it is natural to view Japan and South Korea as future prime movers. Many of the issues pending between Japan and South Korea have roots in the 36 years of Japanese colonial rule of the Korean peninsula, which ended when World War II came to an end in 1945.

What drew the most attention during President No Tae-u's visit to Japan was Prime Minister Kaifu's official apology for the Korean peoples's sufferings inflicted during Japanese colonial rule and the emperor's deep regret over the sufferings. The Japanese Government agreed to take a series of measures to guarantee the rights of third-generation Koreans who were taken away to Japan for use as a cheap labor force during Japan's colonial rule. It also agreed to pay compensation to Korean victims of atomic-bomb attacks in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Regarding this forward-looking posture of the Japanese Government toward South Korea, an observer assessed the posture as an indication of Japan's desire to put an end to the abominable past and its resolve to deal with urgent issues with an eye on the future. For example, South Korea's trade deficit with Japan is over $4 billion. President No Tae-u asked Prime Minister Kaifu to redress this trade imbalance between the two countries during his visit to Japan. Even if the two countries ardently hope for a fresh start in their relations, the past will undoubtedly affect their future relations for a long time.

President No Tae-u expressed his satisfaction with Prime Minister Kaifu's apology and called on his people to accept the Japanese prime minister's apology. However, public reaction in South Korea to the apology was not so favorable. Major newspapers in Seoul carried articles describing the apology as insufficient and a spokesman for the South Korean Foreign Ministry said there is no guarantee that issues of the past will not arise again. Dissident forces in South Korea expressed their discontent with the apology. It seems to me that South Korea's wounds inflicted by the Japanese colonial rule are too deep to be healed by remarks or halfway measures. Even if the rights of Koreans residing in Japan are completely guaranteed and compensation is paid to the Korean victims of atomic-bomb attacks, it is not hard to anticipate that the so-called abominable past will put up emotional barriers in resolving many issues involving areas such as fishing, trade, and technological competition in the future. It seems to me that the question does not stem from the so-called Korean's rancor, but from Japan's attitude reminding Korea of the abominable past.

Let us recall South Korea's backlash to the amendment of history textbooks by the Japanese Government and Japan's high-ranking officials' remarks to justify Japan's aggressive actions in Asia during World War II.

It is reasonable to believe that Japan's growing military spending reminds Asian nations of the actions of the old Japanese empire. For example, in an interview with GAIKO FORUM [DIPLOMATIC FORUM], a Japanese magazine, on the eve of President No Ta-u's visit to Japan, Kim Hak-chun, the president's aide on international affairs, expressed his view on Japan's growing military budget. In the interview, the aide said that Japan's neighbors in Asia, which are aware of how Japan acted as a military superpower in the past, do not want Japan's security role to go beyond Japanese territory. President No Tae-u called on Japan to adhere to its peace constitution during his visit to Japan.

The other Asian nations' cautious assessment of the apology was noteworthy. Philippine Foreign Minister Manglapus and presidential spokesman refrained themselves from making any comment on the apology and (Wei Pinghwa), commentator of LIANHE ZAOBAO, a Chinese newspaper in Singapore, stressed that Japan's apology failed to eradicate Asian nations' distrust in Japan. Professor (Shin Shimeo), a leading researcher on

Japan at Singapore University, also said that the apology failed to remove Korean's distrust, unrest, and wounds.

Japanese Plan for Tanks on Hokkaido Deplored

PM2905134390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 May 90 First Edition p 3

[V. Vinogradov article under the "Observer's Column" rubric: "'POMCUS' Japanese-Style"]

[Excerpts] KYODO news agency has announced the following plan by the Japan Defense Agency. It transpires that the Defense Agency intends by the end of the year to set up five new tank battalions on Hokkaido to "reinforce the ground forces located on the island." In accordance with this plan, approximately 90 tanks from formations currently deployed on the islands of Honshu and Kyushu will be sited in four areas of Hokkaido. The tank grouping on Japan's most northerly island will number more than half of the 1,200 combat vehicles currently in the arsenal of Japan's entire ground forces as a result of this transfer. [passage omitted]

One cannot help but note that the Defense Agency's new plan means a concrete step in Tokyo's move from the idea of "internal defense" to the new strategy which envisages "front-line defense" and even includes "preventive strikes" on enemy territory. The fact that "POMCUS" [Prepositioned Materiel Configured to Unit Sets] Japanese-style is being implemented on Hokkaido illustrates the unshakability of the concept of Japan's ruling circles, which, if they see a threat to the country, see it only from a "northerly direction"—from the Soviet Union. [passage omitted]

It is indisputable that all official Tokyo statements about "vast Soviet military might," along with the "illegitimate Soviet occupation of the northern territories," as people there describe the part of the Kuril Islands whose possession Japan disputes with the USSR, are no more than a cover for its refusal to take concrete steps in the disarmament sphere. At the same time the Defense Agency's implementation of the American "POMCUS plan" attests to the Land of the Rising Sun's increasing involvement in Washington's military-strategic plans, which may have highly pernicious consequences for Japan.

Officals Cite Japan's 'Malicious Poaching'

OW2905183590 Tokyo KYODO in English 1229 GMT 29 May 90

[Text] Moscow, May 29 KYODO—Soviet Fisheries Ministry officials Tuesday called illegal fishing in the Soviet fishing zone by some 12 North Korean-flagged vessels, now under detention, "malicious poaching."

A delegation representing North Korean fishermen had cited the first-time nature of the offense in asking for leniency, they said.

Officials said the North Korean delegation had also stressed the friendly relations between the two nations and the presence of Japanese "specialists" aboard the craft. No request, however, was made to secure the release of the Japanese, they said.

Soviet authorities have detained one North Korean who claims to be the owner and chief operator of the boats.

The ministry said nine of the 12 vessels are set to arrive on the island of Shikotan, one of the four Soviet-occupied islands off Japan's northeastern coast, near midnight Tuesday. Officials say that Taiwanese vessels seized for illegal fishing in Soviet waters are usually taken to Shikotan for hearings.

Soviet patrol boats detained the 12 vessels off the Kamchatka peninsula around May 20 for allegedly poaching salmon originating in Soviet rivers. Some 170 Japanese fishermen were among the crew of more than 200 aboard the boats, which Japanese authorities believe were illegally leased to North Korea by a Japanese company.

In Japan, investigating authorities said the contents of a contract between a Japanese company and the North Koreans indicated the leasing arrangement was a long-term one, valid till 1999.

The contract between the northeastern Hokkaido-based Shoho Fisheries Co. and a North Korean fishery outfit covered a joint operation, with Shoho supplying boats, advisers and marketing for fish caught in North Korean waters, according to maritime authorities.

Concluded in September last year, the contract cites as a goal the revitalizing of Japan's fishing industry, specifying the type of fish to be caught and the boats and equipment to be supplied by Japan.

However, Japanese regulations forbid the leasing of vessels to foreign countries without government permission.

Seized Boats Taken to Shikotan

OW3105134390 Tokyo KYODO in English 1340 GMT 30 May 90

[Text] Moscow, May 30 KYODO—Twelve Japanese fishing boats seized by the Soviet Union for allegedly taking salmon illegally from Soviet territorial waters and high seas while disguised as North Korean vessels have arrived at Shikotan, an official of the Soviet Fisheries Agency in Moscow said Wednesday.

More than 100 Japanese fishermen, taken into custody with their North Korean-registered boats earlier this month fishing off the Kamchatka peninsula, are expected to stand trial in about five days, the official said. The fishermen may be fined or forced to pay compensation for the allegedly poached fish, the official said, adding that the fishing vessels may also be confiscated. The Soviet official later said that all the Japanese

fishermen appeared to be in good health and could be released to return home in about 10 days.

Earlier reports stated that nine of the fishing boats would be taken to Shikotan with the other three bound for Sakhalin. The official did not say if the fishing boats would be taken to another port later.

Meanwhile, in Japan investigators continued efforts to locate the origins of the joint Japan-North Korea fishing operation.

In one statement to investigators in Kushiro, Hokkaido, police learned that an apparently debt-ridden president of a Sapporo trading firm first approached Teruo Watanabe, the head of the Shoho Fisheries Co., about two years ago with "a grandiose plan." According to the testimony, the trading firm president, identified as "A," had individual connections with North Korea for about 10 years and reportedly traded fish processing technology for the import of crabs and other fishing products. The Sapporo importer, apparently seeking to expand business with North Korea, approached Watanabe with the plan.

The man "A" allegedly obtained a used fishing vessel from Watanabe in the fall of 1988 for 7 million yen and as collateral for the vessel's payment offered the Shoho fisheries president his plan for the joint fishing venture.

In an effort to launch his plan, the trading firm [as received] visited North Korea three times for discussions with North Korean officials and won approval from that side last April, launching the "North Korean Deep Sea Fishing Company" in June.

When the contract between North Korean and the new firm was finally signed last September, however, the debt-plagued "A" had been replaced by Watanabe.

In other developments Wednesday, the Kushiro Maritime Safety Office questioned four employers of the Shoho Fisheries Co. about the suspected leasing of 12 fishing vessels to a foreign firm without permission. The Maritime Transport Law bans the lease of vessels without permission from the Fisheries Agency.

In related questioning, investigators also questioned eight fishing officials in Miyako, Iwate Prefecture, and Iwaki, Fukushima Prefecture.

Akio Kyoya, director general of the Fisheries Agency, told the House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries, that Shoho Fisheries Co., at the time of its registration, had indicated it would obtain permission from the Fisheries Agency before entering another nation's territorial waters. "'We expected that it might be an illegal operation, so as a preventive measure we made them submit the letter of promise," Kyoya said.

At a hearing of the House of Councillors Budget Committee, Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries Minister Tomio Yamamoto said that the background of the incident can be located in the increasing hard life of Japanese fishermen who depend upon fishing in the Northern Pacific for their livelihood.

"We would like to devise some policies so that fishermen can realize a good life," said Yamamoto, indicating that the ministry would be addressing the issue in the near future.

Spokesman Notes 'Constant Violation'

OW0206082590 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] The Soviet Union called Japan's attention to the fact that the Japanese side is in constant violation of an intergovernmental agreement between the two countries concerning fisheries cooperation.

A spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry said at a Moscow briefing on 31 May that Japanese fishing boats are boldly infringing upon the bilateral agreement and (?invalidating) its presence itself.

He emphasized that 13 Japanese fishing boats were seized by the Soviet fisheries resources protection agency during the period from the second half of April to the first half of May alone.

Biryukova Attends Osaka Flower Exposition

OW0106165390 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Mr. Seiya Nishida, official representative of the Japanese Government, attended the opening ceremony for the Soviet Day activities at the Flower and Greenery Exposition currently being held at Osaka in Japan. He stated his hopes that the Japan-USSR relations could be promoted in various fields, including politics, economy, trade and culture.

Deputy Premier Biryukova, who attended the ceremony as the representative from the Soviet side, stated that through this exposition, various nations can coordinate their efforts to promote the campaign to preserve the environment on the earth. It is the first time that the Soviet Union is participating in this type of an exposition.

Speaks at Osaka Ceremony

LD0306163790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 3 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] A Soviet Union week is being held in the Japanese city of Osaka at the Expo-90 exhibition devoted to planting trees and gardens and park management.

[Begin recording] [passage omitted] [video shows exhibition, visitors, and Biryukova speaking at opening of Soviet Union Week]

[Biryukova] The Soviet Union views very highly Japan's initiative on holding this exhibition. We believe that its motto "For a caring attitude to nature, for the harmonization of modern man's way of life and the environment," expresses one of the most urgent and humane tasks of humankind today. [passage omitted] [end recording]

PRAVDA's Frolov Meets With ASAHI Chiefs

PM2205141390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 May 90 Second Edition p 5

[Report by special correspondents S. Kolesnikov and I. Latyshev: "At ASAHI's Invitation"]

[Text] Tokyo, 21 May—I.T. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA, arrived in Tokyo today at the invitation of the ASAHI newspaper's editorial office. The program of the visit includes meetings with representatives of Japanese business, political, and journalist circles and lectures on problems of perestroyka in the Soviet Union.

The PRAVDA chief editor met with Toshitada Nakae, president of ASAHI. Later there was a meeting with Eiji Suzuki, president of Mitsubishi Kasei, who is also president of the Japan Federation of Employers' Associations (Nikkeiren)—the influential organization of Japanese business circles.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

U.S. Should Follow Soviet Lead in Closing Bases

HK0106044190 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 31 May 90

[Commentary by Dmitriy (Volskiy)]

[Text] The American military bases in the Philippines rank among the most strategic military facilities in the Asia-Pacific region. Clark Air Base and Subic Naval Base are the Americans' strongest military forces outside the United States. Submarines, aircraft carriers, and strategic aircraft dock and are serviced at the naval base. These facilities have a direct connection to the American military facilities in Japan and South Korea, as well as those in Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean.

(?It goes without saying) that these military facilities include nuclear weapons that (?are aimed) at the Soviet Union and its allies. Therefore, it would seem natural for Washington to dismantle their military facilities, in light of the improved relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. It should come as no surprise that the Filipinos and other groups, which include senators, are calling for the dismantling of the bases.

However, since the agreement covering the military bases expires in September 1991, Washington is maneuvering for an extension of the bases agreement. This has been obvious, particularly during the first part of the ongoing negotiations.

The first phase of the talks between Manila and Washington produced no results because of big differences on both sides, including the matter of compensation, as well the future of the bases.

It has been announced that the next phase of the talks will be held either in June or July. After these talks, an agreement will be signed dealing with the retention of the military bases after the expiry of the treaty in 1991. [sentence as heard] This was said by Catalino Macaraig, Jr., President Corazon Aquino's executive secretary, who is also a member of the presidential commission on the military bases.

One could say that the United States has obtained its objective. However, this is only partial, because of the differences involving financial matters.

So what will be the effect of this on the people of the Asia-Pacific region? The retention of the bases in the Philippines will only (?hinder) the process of disarmament in the region and the (?effectiveness) of the present Soviet-American summit.

[Words indistinct] Global Shield-90, a strategic plan which (?involves) naval operations in the Pacific and Indian Oceans. Meanwhile, an operation called Cobra Gold-90 has just been launched in Southeast Asia, along with the above-mentioned naval operations. All this is going on despite calls for an end to the foreign military presence in the region because of its serious consequences.

Everyone knows that the initiative set forth by the Soviet Union in the Soviet-American INF Treaty covers the Asia-Pacific region. And there has been an extensive arms and troop reduction in the region by the Soviet Union. Furthermore, Soviet President Gorbachev's pronouncements at Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk have heralded widespread cooperation and an end to military goings-on in the Asia-Pacific region. In response to the Soviet pullout from Vietnam's Cam Ranh Bay, the United States (?should) follow the Soviet lead by dismantling its military bases in the Philippines.

(?In response to) a concrete request from Washington, Soviet warplanes in Vietnam were removed. The situation in the Asia-Pacific region will benefit from the Soviet-American treaty, which calls for arms reduction. This will happen as a result of the Soviet-American summit now being held in Washington. This treaty will [words indistinct], as well as weapons from the U.S. 7th Fleet, which is stationed in the Philippines.

In light of all this, the military bases in the Philippines are a dangerous anachronism. As Secretary Macaraig has said, any agreement between Manila and Washington during the bases negotiations should result in a gradual dismantling of the military bases. This was also the stand taken by some American politicians.

Clearly, all this could result in peace flourishing more quickly in the Asia-Pacific region in the very near future.

Ties With Philippines Reviewed on Anniversary

HK0406060190 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Commentary by Anatoliy Aleksandrov]

[Text] The 14th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the Philippines is being observed today. On June 2, 1976, a communique was signed between both countries setting up formal diplomatic relations. The document included a trade treaty, which was the first step in the establishment of commercial relations between both countries.

In the years after the signing of these protocols, visits have been made to the Philippines by officials of the Soviet and Philippine foreign ministries and members of the Soviet parliament and Philippine Government.

Relations between both countries were strengthened even more when Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze visited the Philippines during the latter part of 1988. This was the very first visit to the Philippines by a Soviet foreign minister. During a dialogue with President Corazon Aquino, Shevardnadze expressed the true intention of the Soviet Union to have correct and harmonious relations with the Philippines. He said such a relationship was based on respect for sovereignty, mutual assistance and cooperation, and non-interference in internal affairs.

Aquino responded to this by saying that the Philippines wishes to promote peace in the world, in line with the new political thinking initiated by the Soviet Union. The result of Shevardnadze's visit resulted in the setting up of cooperation in the fields of trade, science, technology, sports, and tourism. On international issues, both countries share the same vision. As enunciated by Philippine Foreign Secretary Raul Manglapus, this has been possible ever since the Philippines took on a pluralistic position on the issue.

According to THE WASHINGTON POST, this view expressed by the Philippine foreign office manifests a new foreign policy outlook which is free from American control and corresponds to that followed by the nonaligned nations.

The last visit to the Soviet Union by Secretary Manglapus proved further that relations between both countries have strengthened. This is the statement he made then:

[Begin Manglapus recording] Our visit to this beautiful country, the Soviet Union, affords us an opportunity to seal our mutual cooperation in the years to come, since we can see that there are many wide-ranging ways in which we can cooperate, despite the fact that our social and political systems differ. We can join hands in economic projects and also engage in political cooperation for the betterment and peace of the world. [end recording]

The changes in the relationship between the Soviet Union and the Philippines are also manifest in such events as the visit last year to the Philippines by a delegation from the Supreme Soviet, headed by Valentina Tereshkova, the first woman cosmonaut, who heads the Soviet Friendship Society for Foreign Countries. She met with President Corazon Aquino. Trade Secretary Jose Concepcion then visited Moscow, accompanied by former science and technology chief Antonio Arizabal.

These visits prove that cooperation in the economic and technological fields by both countries is strengthening. Closer ties in the areas of culture and sports have also taken effect. All this shows that in the entire 14 years during which diplomatic relations have flourished between the Soviet Union and the Philippines, the ties between both countries are bound to grow even stronger.

'Encouraging' Election Results Noted in Burma

BK3105074990 Moscow in Burmese to Burma 1430 GMT 29 May 90

[Aleksandr Vladimirov commentary: "Following the Elections in Myanmar"]

[Text] The results of the People's Assembly election that was held on 27 May are being calculated in Myanmar [Burma]. Here are the remarks by our station correspondent, Aleksandr Vladimirov.

As the results of the elections gradually come to light, it becomes obvious that the National League for Democracy [NLD] and the other opposition political parties are scoring encouraging victories. Spokesmen for the military government told foreign journalists that the NLD has won two thirds of the Parliamentary seats. However, it is still possible that the results that have yet to come in from the remote rural areas may favor the National Unity Party. But it can be predicted even now that the political makeup of Myanmar will not be the same as it was in the past 26 years.

From appearances, and contrary to all predictions, the transfer of power from the military government to a civilian one is about to take place without many hassles. According to the leader of the Information Committee of the State Law and Order Restoration Council [SLORC], U Kyaw Sunn, the SLORC will not set any preconditions to the legally elected government in the transfer of power.

Taking into account such news, a more serious thought must then be given to the drafting of a new state constitution and the formation of a new government. By all appearances, the new state constitution may be drafted in a much shorter time than was expected.

From the statements made before the elections by the leaders of parties that would be entering the parliament, it is apparent that their outlooks on socioeconomic and political issues are similar. In addition, the NLD leaders have announced that they already have a draft state

constitution ready for presentation in the Parliament. Many believe that the draft state constitution will be based on the state constitution of 1947.

Most observers are of the opinion that, unlike the political scene, there may not be drastic changes in the economic sector in Myanmar. Foundations for economic freedom and greater economic cooperation with the other nations have already been laid by the new economic line of the SLORC. However, the unity of the new Parliamentarians is very important in correctly practising and in developing that line.

Aleksandr Vladimirov says: I am of the opinion that as soon as the vote counting is over, a consensus and unity among all the new parliamentarians and the forces backing them will become most vital for the sake of improving the political life in Myanmar.

It is common knowledge that some months ago rightwing elements made a blatant attack on some personages in the National League for Democracy. In addition, problems also continue to exist within the leadership ranks of the other parties. Whatever the situation may be, I believe that the elections held by the military government, which opened a new chapter in the history of Myanmar, lay the foundation for building a massive monument called national reconciliation.

Near East & South Asia

'Arafat Praise for Soviet Summit Stance Noted

LD0406080990 Moscow TASS in English 0645 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Baghdad June 4 TASS—PLO leader Yasir 'Arafat praised the Soviet Union's position of principle at the Soviet-American summit. "I would like to thank Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev for his friendly and principled stance on the Palestinian issue," 'Arafat told TASS and APN correspondents.

"The Soviet leader spoke warmly about the Palestinian people and its leadership during his meeting with U.S. congressmen. His words were heard by all Palestinians. What makes them particularly important is that they were pronounced at the U.S. Congress known for its negative attitude to the Palestinian issue and the Arab nation. We remember its decision on Jerusalem which the U.S. Congress recognised as the capital of Israel in violation of all norms of international law and, incidentally, against the decision of President Bush and his administration. Gorbachev's position will give a new impulse to Soviet-Palestinian and Soviet-Arab relations. Gorbachev pointed to a link between the Middle East peace settlement and the possibility of restoring diplomatic relations with Israel which is violating international law by settling Jewish immigrants on the occupied Arab lands," 'Arafat said.

"We wish success to the Soviet-American summit both in the sphere of bilateral relations and international affairs. We hope that this meeting will help resolve regional conflicts, including the Palestinian problem," 'Arafat emphasised.

Improved U.S. Ties Affect Middle East Policy

LD0306174290 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1400 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Commentary by journalist Dmitriy Zgerskiy: "The Soviet Union and the United States: Flexibility Without Harming Principles"]

[Text] One should notice that the process of talks under way [between the United States and the Soviet Union], including the summit meetings between the two states, raise different reactions in the Arab world. Arab politicians still look at Moscow as a faithful friend of the Arabs, an ally and a partner in solving political and economic matters, but regrettably there are some who look with a somewhat suspicious eye at the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations, and think that the two superpowers will be able to agree on matters of interest to them behind the Arabs' back. But they all follow with perplexity the sweeping wave of self-criticism in the Soviet press, and express dissatisfaction at the Soviet Union's recognition of its mistakes and errors in foreign policy.

It is easy to understand our friends' and enemies' perplexity that the country which has led in space exploration admits it is lagging behind the United States and some Western countries. The country whose defensive power once caused fear, started actively fighting for arms reduction and accepted the withdrawal of its forces from other countries' lands and the reduction of its armed forces. However, the Soviet Union's behavior is logical, and objectively agrees with the interests of the Arab countries.

The policy of the Soviet Union during recent years has become calm, objective, and balanced. The principles of this civilized foreign policy have brought a turning point in U.S.-Soviet relations. In the past, any effort for peace by the United States was dismissed in advance as cunning plotting by the imperialists. The time has come to understand this peaceful effort objectively. It has become clear that the Americans, like us, do not want to fan war (?feelings) in the Third World. There is more mutual trust between the USSR and the United States, and arms reductions have started on both sides.

I believe that this turn not only agrees with the interests of the two superpowers, but also with the interests of all the peoples of the world who are tired of fanning hatred, and who pay the price of the arms race at the expense of their development. The Soviet Union, for instance, understood Baker's plan for a Middle East settlement and agreed on many aspects of it, as well as Husni Mubarak's plan.

Despite this, one can not say that our policy toward the Middle East has departed from its principles, which are

recognized by the whole Arab world. The same principles which were declared in the days of Brezhnev are still in force, and I remind you that according to them, there should be an independent [Palestinian] homeland and state in the now occupied territories. For the sake of peace, the interests of all parties in the conflict should be taken into account.

Who would follow up the liberation of all the Arab territories occupied by Israel, and give guarantees of security to Arab Palestine and Israel [sentence as heard]. This settlement can be achieved through a peace conference where all the parties concerned take part. These principles have not changed at all. On the contrary, they are being actively implemented. Shevardnadze's meeting in Cairo with the leader of the PLO and the Israeli foreign minister one year ago meant taking into account the interests of both sides of the conflict, i.e. trying to understand both. It has become clear more than ever before that the main obstacle to settling the Middle East problem remains Israel's stubborn stand. Here the United States, which always gives military, financial, and political aid to Israel, can undoubtedly play a constructive role. Discussions are being held to this effect between the Soviet Union and the United States. Some forces in the Arab world think that the Soviet Union is almost conniving with the United States, but the experience of tens of years has shown that the endless confrontation with the United States regarding the settlement of the Middle East issue continuously led to increased tension. It did not bring peace closer, but it kept all the opportunities to reach it far away.

The efforts of Soviet diplomacy aimed at persuading the United States to adopt a more objective policy.

End to Violence, Extremism in Middle East Urged

TA3105191290 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1500 GMT 31 May 90

[Commentary by Oleg Ivanov, read by studio announcer]

[Text] The situation in the Middle East has become so bad that it is on the brink of an explosion. The PLO leadership and the doves in Israel have warned against the possibility that acts of terror would recur, as indeed has happened.

This is what our commentator Oleg Ivanov wrote: Violence breeds violence, and in the Middle East it breeds double violence. Ten days ago an Israeli youth shot at Arab laborers in Rishon Leziyyon, killing seven and wounding 10. A week later, a bomb exploded at Mahane Yehuda market in Jerusalem. One 72-year-old man died and 10 others were wounded. Two terrorist organizations claimed responsibility for the acts of terror: the Islamic Jihad and Abu- Musa's [Sa'id Musa Muragha] Fatah-intifadah [organization's name as heard]. Yesterday there was yet another attempted attack which, had it succeeded, could have marked a new record of horror. The security forces managed to foil it in the nick of time. This time the terrorists were dispatched by Abu al-'Abbas [Muhammad 'Abbas], the killer of Achille Lauro fame.

The Arabs claim that the Jews started it all and that they are merely defending themselves, but I think these are not simply exchanges of blows, as the saying goes. Both the terrible Rishon Leziyyon murder and the horrendous acts committed by Palestinian terrorists were geared toward the same goal, the main loser being, as always, the Middle East peace process.

People in Jerusalem now argue that there is no one to talk to in the Palestinian camp, while people on the Palestinian side maintain that it is necessary to forge a united Arab front to launch a jihad against Israel. It should be pointed out in this context that the Islamic Jihad and Abu-Musa are the sworn enemies of the free, new, Palestinian policy aimed at a political solution. Abu al-'Abbas, too, despite his membership in the PLO, has never made a secret of his objection to (?having anything at all to do) with what he has always dubbed the Zionist enemy. On the Israeli side, those who exploited the attack at Mahane Yehuda and the attempted attack in the central region are Rabbi Kahane and the extremist hawks in the Likud.

Once again the extremists on both sides are sitting in the same trench, firing at the doves. The PLO's new policy was born 18 months ago, after a great many difficulties. The opposition to it was fierce, and Yasir 'Arafat demonstrated courage and readiness to reach a far-reaching compromise with his longtime enemy, Israel. It should be pointed out that even now the motto of two states for two nations is still unacceptable to large segments of the Palestinian people. Yet until not too long ago, 'Arafat clung to the option of negotiations despite pressure from left and right. Now, however, the impression is that his initiative is being strangled. The same holds true for Israel, where each attack by Palestinian terrorists increases the hawks' chances of forming an extreme right-wing government, and weakens the moderates. The impression is that among the Palestinians there are forces interested in perpetuating the conflict, just as Messrs. Shamir and Arens argue.

Peres Remarks to Socialist International Cited

PM3105150890 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 May 90 Morning Edition p 6

[D. Velikiy report: "For the First Time in the History of the Socialist International..."]

[Excerpts] Cairo—For the first time in the history of the Socialist International, a session of the organization's council has been held in an Arab country.

The Socialist International accepted with satisfaction the invitation from the Egyptian National Democratic Party, which became a full member of the organization last year, partly because it attaches priority to events taking place in the Near East region and hopes to have a

positive influence on changing the situation here toward peace and social democracy.

At the opening of the conference at the National Democratic Party's headquarters, Egyptian President Husni Mubarak addressed the more than 230 participants. [passage omitted]

There was great interest in the speech at the conference by Shimon Peres, leader of the Israeli Labor Party, who assessed the situation regarding an Israeli-Palestinian settlement.

"This question could get moving if the government became democratic," S. Peres asserts, "this is the basis of our hopes. I speak on behalf of a party that left the government of Israel, and for the first time the basis for the disagreements was not the question of the mechanism of government, but the problem of a peace settlement. We have realized for the first time that the Palestinians are rerady for dialogue, and therefore we gave a vote of no confidence in the government, which was blocking this dialogue."

With regard to the emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union S. Peres recalled that his party, while in government, had been opposed to their settlement in the occupied territories. [passage omitted]

Foreign Ministry on Pakistani Intelligence Actions

LD0106135690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1306 GMT 1 Jun 90

["Text" of USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman's statement]

[Text] Moscow, 1 June, (TASS)—According to an announcement by the press service attached to the president of the Republic of Afghanistan, the leadership of the Pakistani interdepartmental intelligence has, via the Mujahidin headquarters in Peshawar, instructed field commanders of the Afghan opposition in the environs of Kabul to shoot down Soviet transport planes bringing food and essential items to the Afghan population, and to fire on such aircraft parked at Kabul Airport.

This announcement cannot fail to generate concern, because it is a matter of the direct participation of the Pakistani secret services in the actions of the Afghan rebels, which cannot be interpreted as anything other than colluding with, and encourging, terrorism directed against the provision of humanitarian assistance to the Afghan people and posing a direct threat to the lives of the Soviet people who are carrying out that noble mission.

The efforts of the Soviet side to bring about a peaceful political settlement of the Afghan problem as soon as possible are well known. As one of the guarantors of the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, the Soviet Union has a right to expect Pakistan to finally adopt measures to discharge its obligations arising from these agreements. But the actions of Pakistani interdepartmental intelligence, as follows from the announcement referred to above, not only run counter to these agreements, but lead to an even greater complication of the general situation in the region.

In light of all this, we should like to emphasize the responsibility that the Pakistani side is taking upon itself by encouraging the barbarous terrorist acts of the Afghan armed opposition.

Indian Kashmir Initiative Reported

PM0406102390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 90 Second Edition p 6

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Baykov: "India-Pakistan: Peace Initiative"]

[Text] Delhi, 3 Jun—"Is war with Pakistan really inevitable?"—recently Indians have anxiously been asking each other this question with increasing frequency. There has been every reason for this. India's relations with the neighboring state in the dispute over Kashmir have reached an extreme degree of tension.

The troops of both sides have been put on full combat alert all along the Indian-Pakistani border. New army units are regularly being brought up to the border from the hinterland. Exchanges of fire and skirmishes are occurring first on one sector of the border, then on another, and are threatening to grow into a big war at any minute.

The Indian Government has repeatedly stated its desire to avoid a dramatic development of events. "If Pakistan takes a step toward detente," Indian Prime Minister V.P. Singh has said, "we are prepared to take two." Without waiting for Islamabad's reaction to this proposal, the Indian Government itself has come out with an important peace initiative. The press has reported that the Indian Defense Ministry has decided to withdraw Indian troops from the Mahajan border region in the Suratgarh sector—a strategically very important region. In the event of war the quickest routes deep into the Pakistani part of the Punjab are opened up from here. Indian subunits were stationed here at the moment of the extreme aggravation of the situation on the pretext of "fire training."

East Europe

Vorobyev Comments on Troop Pullout From CSFR

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Interview

PM3105134190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 31 May 90 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Colonel General E. Vorobyev, commander of the Central Group of Forces, by APN correspondent V. Fedorov specially for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA; date and place unspecified: "How the Troop

Withdrawal From the CSFR Is Proceeding"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The first phase of the Soviet troop withdrawal from Czechoslovakia ends 31 May. Col. Gen. E. Vorobyev, commander of the Central Group of Forces, shared his thoughts on this subject with an APN correspondent:

[Vorobyev] Despite certain difficulties, which are not fundamental, the withdrawal schedule is being strictly fulfilled. The bilateral agreements initially proposed that 30 percent of the troops would be withdrawn. But by late May we had withdrawn 32 percent of the personnel, 45 percent of the tanks, 31 percent of combat vehicles and armored transporters, 36 percent of weapons and mortars, 63 percent of helicopters, and 34 percent of other vehicles.

We are working intensively but precisely—largely thanks to the Czechoslovak side. It is ensuring timely supplies of freight and passenger cars and guaranteeing the safe movement of truck convoys to the state border. On the Soviet side I would note the well organized work of the Ministry of Railways, particularly the Chop Transshipment Region, the Defense Ministry Central Military Communications Directorate, and the Main Customs Control Administration.

Problems? Yes, there are plenty. I would dwell on the main ones. First, there are the difficulties in providing rolling stock on Soviet territory, which leads to "holdups" at transshipment stations.

Second, the lack of a unified view together with the Czechoslovak experts of the value of the facilities left behind. The protocols on their hand over to the Czechoslovak side indicate their physical condition and two values—Soviet and Czechoslovak. The Central Group of Forces controls 5,408 different installations, and 2,795 of them—that is, around 50 percent—were built with Soviet funds and belong to the Soviet Union. A session of Soviet and Czechoslovak experts will be held in the first half of June on this problem.

The third problem is ecological. I can officially state that currently the Soviet Army in the CSFR [Czech and Slovak Federative Republic] poses no ecological threat to Czechoslovakia through its actions, as has sometimes been written by certain journalists. But we are understanding and responsible about the serious concern of the Czechoslovak leadership and public about the ecological situation in the areas where our troops are deployed, and we are taking immediate measures to instill order. Proposals for our governments on the creation of a separate Soviet-Czechoslovak commission to resolve the ecological problem and work out methods to make good any ecological damage were prepared 11 April.

[Fedorov] Has the population's attitude to you changed?

[Vorobyev] Local citizens' reaction to our troop withdrawal has been entirely explicable. In any state, be it in the West or the East, the activeness of troops creates a certain amount of discomfort for residents. When it comes to a foreign army, the perception is exacerbated all the more. So in the first stage of the troop withdrawal there were emotions. There were protest demonstrations at a number of garrisons. Feelings have quietened down now, and prudence and a sober approach have prevailed.

[Fedorov] What are the feelings of the personnel?

[Vorobyev] I would call them businesslike. Most of the officers and men are preparing to return home. The thoughts of the servicemen have turned entirely to their new postings, and to their housing and everyday problems.

[Fedorov] Are there many difficulties associated with the return?

[Vorobyev] Many, particularly with housing and settling children into schools. But our people realize this. We have sent operational groups to resolve all issues in all districts where units have been dispatched.

[Fedorov] It is said that there have been cases of weapons being sold to the local population.

[Vorobyev] All these are just rumors. But they have prompted some people from the local population to take practical action. Thus in May alone there were three cases of proposals from the local populace asking our servicemen to sell their weapons. These people were arrested by CSFR organs—and with the help of our officers and men—when they attempted to close the deals.

[Fedorov] Is it true that female volunteer servicemen are making every effort to put themselves forward as brides just to stay in the CSFR?

[Vorobyev] These pseudo facts have prompted a negative reaction among the Central Group of Forces women's collective and have been seen as an attempt to compromise our women in the eyes of the Czechoslovak public. There have been several announcements on city streets written in broken Russian—but this is not serious!

[Fedorov] Recently CTK reported that several dozen mines left by Soviet troops had been found in the town of Frenstat pod Radhostem. What's it all about?

[Vorobyev] Fifty-two training mines—that is, mines made out of wood and iron—were discovered. Our commission is investigating this sloppiness. And although it is not a question of combat mines—just imitation mines with no explosives—an order has been issued to set up additional sapper groups to carry out thorough checks of the installations that are being left.

[Fedorov] Will exercises and troop movements take place during the coming 8 June elections?

[Vorobyev] The first phase of the withdrawal ends 31 May. We will be summing up its results. From 6 through 10 June the withdrawal will be halted to prevent any misunderstandings.

IZVESTIYA Interview

PM0106134390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Telephone interview with Colonel General E. Vorobyev, commander of the Central Group of Forces, by own correspondent V. Litovkin: "Returning Home. First Phase of Withdrawal of Soviet Troops From Czechoslovakia Has Ended"—date of interview not given; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] Is the withdrawal proceeding on schedule, what problems are our officers and their wives and children encountering, how are these problems dealt with—these and other questions were put by our correspondent to Col.l Gen. E. Vorobyev, USSR people's deputy and commmander of the Central Group of Forces, when he called him on the telephone from Moscow at the Milovice military garrison some 40 km from Prague, the headquarters of the Group of Soviet Forces.

[Vorobyev] In our view, and according to the opinion of the Czechoslovak side, the withdrawal of Soviet troops is proceeding strictly on schedule. Naturally, we are not immune from minor hitches and misunderstandings, but we are resolving all problems quickly and in a coordinated fashion and we are able to firmly guarantee today that the deadline for the return of our people, hardware, arms, and materiel will be strictly met.

At the time of our conversation 24,600 people, or 34 percent of the group's total personnel, and also 11,000 women and children, or 30 percent of those due to return to the Union, have already crossed the border. As for combat hardware, the figures are as follows: So far 551 tanks, or 45 percent of tanks subject to withdrawal, have returned, and also 859 infantry fighting vehicles and armored personnel carriers, 440 guns and mortars, 22 rocket launchers, 92 helicopters, and 5,717 motor vehicles. Add to this some 40,000 tonnes of materiel. Compare this information with the data published in IZVESTIYA 26 February and you will see for yourself that more than one-third of the personnel, hardware, and property has been withdrawn from Czechoslovakia during the first stage. And in the case of launchers and helicopters this ratio has been exceeded and totals 74 percent and 53 percent, respectively.

The withdrawal goes on around the clock at an average pace of three trains carrying troops, hardware, and arms, plus two trains carrying materiel per day. One high-speed passenger train a day leaves Milovice for Moscow with servicemen's families on board. Sometimes the Ministry of Railways supplies additional passenger trains at our request.

[Litovkin] As far as I know, the materiel of the Group of Forces is being shipped out not only by rail but also by road. What is the situation on the highways?

[Vorobyev] Fortunately, there have been no incidents. This is the result of a careful overhaul of the vehicles, people's responsible attitude, and, of course, much assistance from our Czechoslovak comrades. The state road safety service is ensuring free passage for our convoys of 25 to 30 trucks. It provides an escort from the point of departure to the border. There have been no breakdowns or vehicles that have failed to keep up.

Incidentally, I must mention not just the smooth work of the Czechoslovak side, but also of our Ministry of Railways, their colleagues from the Ministry of Defense Central Directorate for Military Communications, workers of the Chop transshipment center, border guards, and customs officials. The latter inspect the baggage of our officers and members of their families at the group's garrisons while the goods are being loaded into containers outside people's houses, where they are then sealed. The goods are handed over to the Ministry of Railways and conveyed to the new deployment station without delay.

[Litovkin] How is the hand over to the Czechoslovak side of the housing stock, barracks, and other installations either leased from the host country or belonging to us progressing? What problems are arising?

[Vorobyev] We have already handed over 18 of the 25 military base compounds which we are due to vacate during the first stage. This comprises 27 apartment blocks, 2,810 apartments with a total floor space of 86,200 square meters, of which 1,678 apartments with a floor space of 57,600 square meters belong to our country. And also 12 hostels for 727 people, and other installations which are also our property.

Everything that has either been leased by the Soviet side or built with our money is being handed over to the official Czechoslovak organs and a detailed protocol is being compiled and signed. Why is this? Certain differences remain between us as to the value of the Soviet installations and the rent paid for the leased facilities. Each side has its own assessment and its own arguments. They are to be settled by experts who are currently at work here.

In addition, measures connected with the marketing of Soviet installations are being elaborated under the leadership of experts from the Ministry for Foreign Economic Relations. This concerns officers messes, military unit clubs, housing, administrative buildings, hardware depots, technical servicing and repair facilities, gas stations, and even airfields—anything that might in the future be used either by joint ventures or by Soviet organizations operating in Europe. These include "Sovtransavto," "Intourist," "Sputnik," and others.

[Litovkin] What is the value of the equipment that is being left behind?

[Vorobyev] That is a commercial secret of the Ministry for Foreign Economic Relations.

[Litovkin] What is the mood among the departing servicemen? After all, it is no secret that certain of our officers chose to go abroad partly because they hoped to improve their material position. And now, a few months later, they are having to return. There must be a certain amount of disillusionment and disappointment...

[Vorobyev] Yes, quite. Let us not close our eyes to the realities. This did occur, but only at the beginning. Now, and I can say this with the utmost responsibility, a radical change has begun. The moral climate here has changed as a result of the official assessment of the events of August 1968. People have grasped that although they do not bear any personal responsibility for all this, they are uninvited and therefore unwanted guests in the country. And therefore all their thoughts are now devoted to returning home and to life and work in the new place.

Furthermore, the group's command and the leadership of the Ministry of Defense are making every effort to remove even the slightest tensions and not to allow resentment to build up.

You probably know that all children who are attending school and whose fathers have departed on the troop trains are allowed to complete the academic year in the Group of Forces. They have stayed behind with their mothers. They have been given food allocations and had Soviet money changed into Czechoslovak currency.

Our operational groups have been dispatched to all the areas of new deployment. These groups comprised generals and officers representing the command and also members of social organizations. They saw for themselves on the spot that everything is ready to receive the troops and their families and have reported to their comrades on returning to their units what has been done and how.

I can add that people had been worried that they might be deployed in the Belorussian and Moscow Military Districts in areas which had been affected by the Chernobyl tragedy. Our representatives saw with their own eyes that such fears are unfounded. And in the one and only case where dosimeters produced background radiation readings which were very slightly above the permissible level, the place of deployment was changed by decision of the General Staff.

We are trying to make sure that people know the whole truth, and also that everything possible is being done for them, and this is helping to remove tensions.

[Litovkin] What welcome are you getting at home?

[Vorobyev] A good one, on the whole. The command of the Belorussian, Moscow, Volga-Urals, and Siberian Military Districts, together with the party and soviet leadership in the new areas of deployment, is providing us with every possible assistance. Barracks for servicemen, housing and hostels for families and bachelors, and schools for children have been prepared. Problems pertaining to job placement, registration, and provision of material, everyday, and medical services and other questions are being resolved.

Alas, for the time being it will be necessary to live in confined circumstances. One room per family. Wherever there are no cooking facilities, officer-family messes will be organized where all the inhabitants of the base compound will be catered to. People are morally ready for difficulties. They know that they will have to cope with a certain amount of deprivation. They know that nothing will fall into their laps. There is only one thing that we do not understand. How can anyone brazenly exploit our difficulties connected with the troop withdrawal in order to make political capital.

NASHA GAZETA, which is published in the Kuzbass, announced to its readers that the two Soviet Army battalions due to arrive there are allegedly being sent for "policing purposes" to deal with the rebellious Kuzbass. An insulting, inflammatory lie. The battalions in question are purely technical—a communications and a radio engineer battalion. I am convinced, of course, that the article was not a reflection of the opinion of the region's working people. We are not strangers among our own people.

[Litovkin] What other problems are causing you trouble?

[Vorobyev] There are relatively many of them. They include ecological questions, which we are resolving jointly with the Czechoslovak side, questions of combat training, which have noticeably pushed into the background, the reinforcement of discipline... It is impossible to list them all. The main thing is to withdraw the Soviet troops from Czechoslovak territory strictly in accordance with the intergovernmental agreement, on time, and in an organized fashion. We are totally confident that this task will be implemented by 30 June 1991.

CSFR's Havel Writes to Gorbachev, Bush

LD3105081390 Moscow TASS in English 0654 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Prague May 31 TASS—Czechoslovak President Vaclav Havel's message to Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush was conveyed to the Soviet and American ambassadors to Czechoslovkaia by Czechoslovak Deputy Foreign Minister Zdenek Matejka here on Wednesday.

The message expresses concern over the latest developments at the Vienna negotiations on conventional armaments and expresses the hope that the forthcoming Soviet-American summit in Washington will bring about major decisions in nuclear disarmament and such political decisions that will enable the accomplishment of the Vienna negotiations in the near future.

In his message Havel assured the presidents that Czechoslovakia has always sought to help find an early solution of outstanding problems at the negotiations.

Hungary Rejects Pact, Wants 'Correct' Ties

PM0106140790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 90 First Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Hungary: Government Program"]

[Text] Budapest, 31 May—The new Hungarian Government's foreign policy program circulated here says that the Hungarian Republic will implement an independent foreign policy based on the primacy of national interests.

It stresses that Hungary wants balanced, correct, good-neighborly relations with the Soviet Union based on equality. Both Hungary's political and economic ties with the USSR must be put on a new footing in the interests of achieving this.

According to the document, Hungary's membership in the Warsaw Pact contradicts the will of the people as expressed in 1956 and confirmed in the recent elections. The program voices the opinion that there is no need for the Warsaw Pact to exist. Hungary wants to begin talks on this subject with the Warsaw Pact states in the interests of achieving their legal, military, and political aspirations.

Hungary wants Soviet troops to leave the country's territory before the previously agreed date—30 June 1991.

Hungarian Foreign Minister G. Jeszenszky said at a news conference here that the most important avenue of renewed Hungarian foreign policy is its reorientation from East to West. However, the new Hungarian Government considers it extremely important to develop ties with the USSR. It would not be in Hungary's interests to wind up or limit these ties.

'Intourist' Cancels USSR Trips to GDR

LD0106231190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1632 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Report by TASS Correspondent Vladimir Yegorov]

[Text] Moscow, 1 June (TASS)—Soviet tourists who were planning to spend their summer holidays in the German Democratic Republic will have to change their plans. The All-Union joint stock company "Intourist" has been informed by its partner firm in the GDR "Reisburo" that from now on payments for tourist services in the Republic will have to be in West German currency. This is connected with the coming into force on 1 July, 1990 of the currency treaty between the two German states.

Since "Intourist's" currency reserves are extremely limited, it will be obliged to cancel Soviet citizens' trips to the GDR, at least until October when it is possible that mutually acceptable options may be found.

"For many years, trips to the GDR have been in constant demand here," said Vladimir Malinin, general director of "Intourist", in a conversation with the TASS correspondent. "This year, too, they had been sold out to the end of the season. It will be a shame if our tourist exchanges begin to decline."

Soviet Troop Withdrawal From Poland Begins

LD0106232390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Here is another report from Warsaw, this time by our correspondent:

[Correspondent Y. Ulyanov, identified by caption] The withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland began today. It is taking place in accordance with the Soviet command's plan for the reduction of the Armed Forces, including those stationed abroad. Members of an airborne assault brigade are saying farewell to the town of Bialogard in the northwest of the country. Inhabitants of the town and representatives of the Polish Army command and the Soviet Army's Northern Group of Forces have come to see them off. Seventeen officers in the brigade have been awarded brotherhood-in-arms medals, which are presented to them by Lieutenant-General Mieczyslaw Debicki.

He considers that the withdrawal of Soviet troops should, in accordance with the agreement with the Polish side, be carried out gradually, in step with the process of strengthening security in Europe. Farewell Poland!

PAP Cited on Attack on Gdansk Consulate

LD0406092390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] There has been an outburst of extremism against the USSR's Consulate General in Gdansk. According to a PAP agency report, a group of youths from an anarchist organization mounted a protest demonstration outside the consulate against the murder of an anarchist that is supposed to have occurred in the Soviet Union. A number of bottles filled with an inflammable compound were thrown at the building and a window was broken. Fortunately, fire did not break out. It should be remarked that the police took no steps to stop this act of hooliganism.

West Europe

British Premier's Visit to USSR Previewed

PM0406143190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jun 90 Second Edition p6

[Own correspondent A. Lyutyy report: "Guests of the Goodwins"]

[Excerpts] London, June—On some red London double-decker buses of late a vivid inscription in Russian which says "Welcome!" has appeared. This is how Intourist is exhorting people to visit our country. Each time I see this advertisement I find myself thinking: "Ten years ago the the city's transport department would scarcely have permitted that kind of graphic publicity in favor of the USSR. Times were different then.... [passage omitted]

Soviet-British relations have now reached a new era. The scale of our dialogue could, of course, be measured by the number of state and parliamentary visits, political consultations, agreements, and public contacts. But ordinary British people are sometimes more receptive to symbols like the slogan on London's double-decker buses. Or to reports that British Secretary of State for Defense, Tom King, who visited our country recently, gave an impromptu press conference right in the cockpit of a Soviet MiG-29 fighter aircraft at an airfield near Moscow.

These symbols of change are breaking our stereotyped ideas about one another and promoting an amicable, steady, and as yet far-from-sated interest here toward Soviet people and their history, culture, and way of life. That interest is mutual, incidentally. A USSR Week was held successfully in Birmingham in 1988. And now the British side is staging British Days in the Soviet Union, in Kiev, from 4-30 June. The program is impressively broad and diverse. Britain has never staged anything like it before in the Soviet Union. [passage omitted]

The program of the British Days includes in all some 25 major events of various kinds. The Ukrainian capital will be receiving about 850 guests from Great Britain. In short, it is not possible to tell you about everything but I can make particular mention of certain participants in the "British Reality Today" exhibition.

These "participants" are the Goodwin family. Ian Goodwin is the head of the family. He is 43 years old. Her works at a plant. His wage is more than 13,000 pounds per annum. His wife, Anne, is 41 years old. She is a housewife, but she earns some extra money at a candy factory—4,000 pounds per annum. Their 19-year-old daughter Emma is a probationer at a printing plant. Her earnings are 4,800 pounds per annum. Her 16-year-old brother Peter is preparing for his univeristy entrance examinations. [passage omitted]

During the British Days in the Soviet Union there will be another Soviet-British summit meeting. Every such summit held so far in recent years has been an important event for bilateral relations and for all world politics. The dialogue between our countries is a stabilizing factor in international relations and an example of how affairs between two countries with different social systems can and must be conducted: in a spirit of mutual respect, responsibility, and partnership.

London and our country have fairly similar approaches to a whole series of problems. This applies to the development of the all-European process and the question of German unification, although the problem of NATO membership for a united Germany is still the subject of differences of opinion. The Soviet Union values the understanding with which the British Government is approaching the difficult situation that has now developed in our country. The trade and economic aspect of M. Thatcher's forthcoming visit to our country has particular significance. At first glance, the situation in our bilateral economic ties seems perfectly favorable. Trade has exceeded the target 2.5 billion rubles set by the two countries' leaders. British exports to the Soviet Union rose by 33 percent last year. But if we look at the trade structure, from our point of view it is still traditionally to our disadvantage. Raw materials and semi-manufactures form the basis of Soviet exports. New forms of bilateral economic ties are established with difficulty. Of the 82 joint Soviet-British enterprises registered in our country, only about 15 percent are engaged in real production activity.

We could also look for flaws in our partners, of course. We could again mention the COCOM [Coordinating Committee on Multilateral Export Controls] lists and complain about the lower competitiveness of a number of British goods in comparison to Japanese or West German goods. All that is true on the whole. But at this stage there are, nevertheless, far more possibilities for improving our own foreign economic policy.

Isolated successes by our associations on the British market are rather the result of initiative shown by some committed people than the consequence of a well-ordered system of foreign trade operations at work. After all, when it comes down to it, the majority of personnel engaged in foreign economic ties here are on a fixed salary and could quite well not "stick their necks out" at all. Has the time not come to make our foreign trade associations self-financing structures, which would be in organic harmony with the principles of a regulated market rather than the edict system, which stifles any initiative? The formula is simple: What you earn is what you get.

I recently had occasion to talk with a high-ranking representative of the British Trade and Industry Department (under this department's regulations I am unable to give his name—A.L.). My interlocutor was satisfied, on the whole, with the state of affairs in our bilateral trade and looked to the future not without optimism. But there is a point in quoting some of his critical observations:

"We are concerned by the fact that Soviet exports fall short of the British level in value terms. We would like movement to be really bilateral. Another point of concern is the delay in payments by a whole series of Soviet foreign trade organizations. I am thinking, for example, of 'Soyuzpromeksport,' 'Promsyryeimport,' 'Soyuzkhimeksport,' and 'Medeksport.' Although I must also point out that we are grateful to the Soviet authorities for the fact that they have helped us to sort out two or three such difficult situations.

"Some changes in your legislation concerning foreign economic activity," the ministry representative continued, "are presenting our firms with unexpected surprises. This primarily applies to legislation on joint enterprises. I must say that Poland or Hungary are making vigorous efforts to bring the financial and legal base of their foreign economic ties more into line with Western standards and to protect the rights of companies coming onto their market. Ideally, in the new Europe we would like to see equal conditions for entrepreneurs throughout the continent, from the Atlantic to the Urals."

Our conversation got onto the trade exhibition in Kiev. We talked, for example, about how the Soviet consumer is so often shown a tantalizing picture of the wonders of Western technology and goods in fine packaging which have so far never been glimpsed in stores in the Soviet Union.

"There has been virtually no trade in consumer goods or the equipment for their manufacture between our countries in the past," my interlocutor replied. "As a rule, Soviet organizations have ordered heavy equipment and machine tools. But the situation is now changing and we are looking for ways to satisfy the needs of the consumer sector. A whole consortium of British firms has been set up, which are prepared to help your agriculture. We can supply comprehensive equipment for processing sugar beet and potatoes. But the fact that the consortium's potential is not being exploited to the full is rather the failing of the Soviet side than ours."

There are considerable reserves for improving the possibilities in our bilateral economic cooperation. It is good that the sides talk openly to one another about shortcomings. That is another quality of our relationship. Of course, no country will help us to bring the average standard of living up to that of the Goodwin family, which is not even all that prosperous by British standards. We ourselves must do this first and foremost. But even businesslike professional advice and prompting by word and deed is a considerable help along this path.

Declaration Signed With UK on Science Links

PM2905131790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 90 First Edition p 7

[Own correspondent A. Lyutyy dispatch: "Pooling Efforts. Scientists Cooperate"]

[Text] London, 28 May—A delegation from the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, comprising scientists and specialists in the most varied areas, has arrived in Britain. And for the first time representatives of the space industry are visiting the British Isles.

During meetings and talks with the leaders of the British Science and Technology Research Council—the main body in the country coordinating scientific development projects—a joint declaration was signed.

The document opens up the possibility of pooling the efforts of British and Soviet scientists not only in carrying out scientific development projects but also in putting their results into production and organizing links between college science and industry.

THE TIMES called the declaration a "historic agreement." Indeed, it is unprecedented in the history of our scientific cooperation.

Yazov Visits Italy, Views Disarmament

PM0106140490 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 25 May 90 p 10

[Luciano Fontana report: "Marshal Yazov Visits Italian Bases"]

[Excerpt] Rome—He was cordial and ready to stop and talk, breaking the rules of protocol. The icy image of the Soviet military was broken yesterday afternoon in parliament by Marshal Dmitriy Yazov, Soviet defense minister, who had come to Italy for a three-day visit. He engaged in lively discussions with the deputies and senators of the Defense Commission, and broke appointments by stopping to talk and to give frank answers to all questions on German unity, disarmament, the USSR's problems, the Soviet military's anxieties, and the new security model for Europe.

Yazov is regarded as the interpreter of the Soviet military's interests, of their fears about the separatist thrusts which are likely to break up the USSR. Only 20 days ago, during the parade to mark the victory over Nazism, he advocated the military's role in supporting the integrity of the USSR and the party. Yesterday, during the discussions in parliament behind closed doors, he used a tone of dialogue which was closely in line with Gorbachev's "new thinking" in international relations. Upon leaving the meeting, in reply to a question, the marshal denied that the Soviet military is pressing to delay the agreement on reducing conventional armaments: "It is an accusation which relates directly to me but I can clearly reply: We do not want to delay anything. The only problem is this: The situation has changed radically since we decided on the cuts. For instance, we included the GDR in the numbers of Warsaw Pact troops and arms; but what are we to do now? We must look at the new balance of forces."

Yazov defended the two Germanys' right to unite. "We were the first to propose it," he said, "but we do not want an annexation. The rights of the two peoples must be safeguarded, as must the interests of all other countries." The marshal referred to the Soviet Union's suffering and the 22 million Soviet people who died in World War II: "With unification, now we can really say that the war is over. However, this means gaurantees on borders and on security for other countries. Otherwise, German unity could destabilize Europe." The Soviets are thinking of a transitional solution with the new German state having dual membership in NATO and the Warsaw Pact until a

joint European security system emerges with the disappearance of the two blocs. "We cannot fail to consider our interests," Yazov added. "The United States has bases in Italy and the Philippines for its security, and we have bases in the GDR. How can we unilaterally abandon them without being involved in a process which guarantees our security too?"

The defense minister emphasized the irrationality of a Europe packed with nuclear weapons, and international relations still based on the idea of the "enemy." The new model will have to be based on three principles, the marshal said: rejection of weapons as a foreign policy tool, the superiority of politics over the military, and freedom and independence for all people. "Following these principles, we are converting our armed forces to achieve a reasonable and adequate defense. The unilateral cuts that we have made in our military apparatus, including 800 planes and 40 ships demonstrate this." [passage omitted]

Bundeswehr Tour Part of Quest for Neighborliness

PM3105125590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 may 90 First Edition p 3

[APN own correspondent Yu. Kazakov report "especially for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA": "The Bundeswehr's Peaceful Landing in Russia"]

[Excerpts] It is not every day that Soviet generals turn up at the the Bundeswehr's "inner leadership" center. Major General Leonid Supran, Soviet military attache in the FRG, arrived at the center for a meeting with a group of West German servicemen, who are leaving for a 10-day trip to the Soviet Union. This is a return visit. A year ago our boys and girls in military uniform had an opportunity to form their own impressions of the Federal Republic and its citizens, including those serving in the Armed Forces. Then, as now, the meetings between servicemen of the two countries were organized by the press: the influential West German newspaper DIE WELT, and the Soviet NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY. [passage omitted]

The guests from the FRG will visit Moscow, Leningrad, and Kiev. Of course, it is difficult to say at present what impressions they will form from their contact with Soviet people or how they will perceive our perestroyka. But they have a lot of meetings scheduled for them—with engineers at the Antonov Experimental Design Bureau, peasants, journalists, and people's deputies. Of course, they are to have conversations with Soviet servicemen as well. A visit to a Soviet division is also in store for the guests.

Undoubtedly, when compared with the gigantic changes taking place in the world, the exchange of military delegations between the two countries may seem an insignificant event to some people. But such exchanges also testify to the extremely profound desire of peoples to switch to normal neighborly conditions on this planet.

Naval Squadron To Call at FRG Port

LD0206193490 Moscow TASS in English 1922 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 2 TASS—A squadron of Soviet naval vessels, comprising the destroyer Bystry and the escort ship Neukrotimy, will call at the West German port of Kiel from June 5 to 8, it was officially announced here today.

FRG Official Proposes USSR Join NATO

LD0206141590 Moscow TASS in English 1339 GMT 2 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeni Gulkin]

[Text] Bonn June 2 TASS—A senior official of the West German Defence Ministry proposed that the Soviet Union join the NATO bloc.

Parliamentary State Secretary Willy Wimmer told the newspaper WELT AM SONNTAG that Soviet membership was possible if the Soviet side observed the "rules of game" in the North Atlantic treaty.

Introducing a democratic rule-of-law state and a market economy are the other conditions for Soviet membership of NATO he said.

Austria's Laenderbank Opens Office in Moscow

PM0106121790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 May 90 Morning Edition p 3

[M. Berger article under the "Fact and Comment" rubric: "Between the Risk of Failure and the Chance of Success"]

[Text] One of Austria's largest banks—the "Laenderbank"—has opened an office in Moscow.

"A bank is a professional risk taker," G. Wagner, chairman of the "Laenderbank" Governing Board, remarked in the course of a roundtable of bankers, academics, and Soviet and Austrian journalists. The discussion took place on the opening day of the "Laenderbank House" in Moscow and this, generally speaking, was not quite in the tradition of such events. In spite of the solemnity of the occasion, it bore a far from ceremonial character. Are the Austrian bankers sufficiently aware of the complexity of the situation in which our economy finds itself? Have they really taken into account all the options for development of events in our as yet unstable market? What will the office's specific task be, seeing that, according to the law now in force, so-called cash transactions—in other words, banking activity as such—are forbidden to foreign banks on our territory? In practice, their offices in Moscow perform the role of special missions: They hold talks with enterprises and departments and prepare various deals which are later clinched by the bank's headquarters itself or by one or another of its branches.

"Laenderbank" can already be found in 17 cities in Europe, the United States, and Asia. Why is it establishing yet another office, this time in Moscow, whose maintenance in our capital would be an extremely expensive undertaking? Ideally, of course, the bank reckons that, as soon as the law allows, its office will evolve into an autonomous branch, offering the full range of banking services to enterprises, firms, and companies, and to private clients. And why not? Incidentally, M. Franz, head of the Moscow office, can be considered an expert in transformations of this type. In the early eighties he held a similar post in New York where, due to his active work, a fully fledged branch developed later.

Of course, conditions in Moscow and New York differ somewhat, but even the developed market creates a number of difficulties—it is not so simple to get on one's feet in conditions of really tough competition. When reform reaches a certain stage of development in our country—and the necessity to allow foreign capital into the financial market being created in our country is being voiced from the highest tribunes—"Laenderbank" will find itself better prepared for the new conditions. It will already have its own place, its own position in the budding market. The bank's strategic plans are based on this.

The bank expects to deal not only with central departments in Moscow, but also with other regions of the country, and its clients will be Soviet and Austrian enterprises, cooperatives, and multinational concerns from Britain, the United States, Hong Kong, South Korea, Taiwan, and India, where "Laenderbank" branches operate and therefore certain advantages in establishing links with these countries' markets exist. The bank has plans for financing trade operations, enterprises, various projects, consultations, market research, issuing loans, granting credits,—in short a host of business. Will it succeed? Much will depend on how our reforms go, and how quickly a fully-fledged financial market starts to operate in our country.

Meanwhile, one small "Laenderbank" project has already materialized in Moscow. A magnificent imported children's playground has appeared in the public garden by "1905 Street" Subway Station, installed by the "Perestroyka" Joint Soviet-U.S. Enterprise on orders from the bank and Austrian firms coooperating with it. Presumably this gift is meant to show the bank's attitude toward the city where it has found a home, so that even those who have nothing to do with financial transactions could see that the presence of foreign capital can serve the place where it is located quite well.

As for purely professional problems, a word should be said about the serious support given recently to Austrian businessmen working in the East European direction. Austria's Federal Finance Minister F. Lacina, who arrived especially for the opening ceremony of "Laenderbank House," announced that a law was adopted there three weeks ago, under which the state underwrites part of the risk of implementing deals with the USSR and certain other East European countries. A special fund has been set up for this purpose, which will insure businessmen against sundry unforeseen circumstances and will thus stimulate business activity.

Austrian legislators are helping their businessmen, who operate between the risk of failure and the chance of success, to get nearer to success.

Protocols on Military Conversion Signed in Vienna

LD0106170390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1530 GMT 31 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Excerpt] Vienna, 31 May (TASS)—The signing of seven protocols on intentions to cooperate in the area of military production conversion in the Soviet Union brought a Soviet-Austrian conference on "East-West cooperation in the sphere of reorienting the military enterprises of the USSR into the manufacture of civilian output" to an end in Vienna today. They involve organizing cooperation with the major firms of the Alpine republic that are operating in the main in the area of metal-intensive production: machine tool building and machine building. The Soviet experts who took part in the two-day forum, organized by "Unikon", a famous management consultant association, represented the interests of enterprises in Chelyabinsk Oblast, the Urals, Moscow, Siberia, and the Baltic. [passage omitted]

U.S. Bases Agreement With Greece Detailed

PM0106084390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 90 Second Edition p 7

[Report by own correspondent V. Potapov: "Foregone Conclusion. Concerning Greek-American Talks on Bases"]

[Text] Athens, 30 May—The final round of talks on the future of U.S. bases in Greece has begun in the Greek capital. However, according to information that has percolated into the local press, accord on the 12 points of the new treaty was effectively reached at the previous Greek-American meeting in Washington.

Although the Greek Government spokesman has confirmed only the duration of the new treaty—eight years (the previous one, which expired in December 1988, operated for five years)—newspaper commentaries are full of discussion of the details of the agreement. The main conclusion of the paper RIZOSPASTIS is that Washington has essentially managed to secure an "ideal framework for widening its strategic activities." By reducing its number of bases from four to two, the United States has merely concentrated its military activities and made them cheaper, but it has not reduced them. Washington secured yet another concession from the Greek side: Refueling of its aircraft in flight above Greek territory. According to newspaper commentaries, Athens is obliged to inform Washington of its five-year

armament programs, giving it a major say in the sphere of "coordinating actions." In response to the display of "flexibility," the papers write, U.S. Secretary of State Baker sent Congress a letter asking it to grant Greece $350 million in military aid.

Sweden Vote Against Recognizing Lithuania Noted

PM0406154790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Single Edition p 6

[Unattributed report: "Stockholm. Proposal Rejected"]

[Text] The Swedish Riksdag (Parliament) has rejected by a majority of votes a proposal on the immediate recognition of Lithuania's independence put forward by the party for the protection of the environment. A total of 306 deputies voted against, while 19 "Greens" and one People's Party member voted for the proposal.

The ballot in the Riksdag concluded the course of the discussion of the question of Sweden's attitude toward the processes in the Baltic republics, which loomed large during the current session. During the discussion deputies from leading political parties advocated expanding economic, cultural, and scientific ties with these republics.

At the same time, parliamentarians from the ruling Swedish Social Democratic Labor Party [SAP] and most of the opposition parties said that they were against diplomatic recognition of Lithuania. "The three Soviet Baltic republics are now trying to leave the union," SAP Deputy S. Eriksson said. "The USSR Supreme Soviet adopted a law on the procedure that a union republic should follow in order to become an independent state. Many people in the West are worried that little Lithuania will become a stumbling block for perestroyka and glasnost."

Shevardnadze Arrives in Denmark

LD0406013190 Moscow TASS in English 0125 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Copenhagen June 4 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze arrived in Copenhagen today for the conference on CSCE human dimension, due to open on June 5.

Latin America & Caribbean

Foreign Ministry Views Contra Demobilization

LD0106111990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1420 GMT 31 May 90

[Report by TASS diplomatic correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow, 31 May—At a briefing today Vadim Perfilyev, USSR Foreign Affairs Directorate first deputy chief, assessed the statement made the other day by the UN Security Council chairman as a reflection of the international community's anxiety in connection with attempts to drag out the demobilization process of the contras in Nicaragua. It expresses Security Council members' concern at the deceleration disarmament process of the contras. In doing so the Council members firmly voice the need to accelerate this process and to complete it within the time frame agreed on between the Nicaraguan Government and the armed opposition, that is, by 10 June this year.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman noted that the armed opposition's attempts to drag out the demobiliation process is threatening to further stabilize the situation in Nicaragua and in Central America as a whole. Having expressed his confidence in the Nicaraguan Government's striving to "fully and conscientiously fulfill its obligations under the accords reached," the diplomat also stated that the armed opposition is guided in its actions "by no means by the desire to join in Nicaragua's civilian life as soon as possible. Instead they are striving to influence the country's internal political process to ends which are suitable to themselves."

"The Soviet Union believes that all states, which, by virtue of various circumstances have certain possibilities to bring the necessary influence to bear on the contras' line will take the necessary steps with a view to inducing them to strictly comply with the spirit and letter of the agreement and to carry out their complete demobilization by 10 June this year," Vadim Perfilyev said.

"In our view the Security Council and UN secretary general are called upon to continue focusing on this acute problem and to react adequately to developments in the situation," he stressed. From the Soviet point of view, "it is important that the Organization of American States continues making its own positive contribution to achieving the contras' demobilization and national reconciliation in Nicaragua."

In conclusion, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stated that in the Soviet Union "the Rio de Janeiro group joint communique has been received with satisfaction." In it a number of Latin American governments "practically identify themselves with the United Nations Security Council chairman's statement," and express firm support for the UN's activities in Nicaragua. They stress that the contras are obliged to fully observe the accords reached by the presidents of the Central American states on ending the armed struggle and strengthening peace and democracy in that country.

Supreme Soviet Session

Reportage on 4 Jun Supreme Soviet Session

Third Session Reopens

LD0406080290 Moscow TASS in English 0734 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Vladimir Isachenkov and Andrey Orlov]

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—The last week of the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet started today after parliamentarians rested on Saturday and Sunday.

Just as Russia's deputies, working in a neighbouring building, the members of the Soviet parliament started today's meeting with a minute of silence to honour the memory of Soviet people who died a year ago in a railway accident on Ufa-Chelyabinsk stretch.

Later, at a joint sitting of the chambers, the parliament resumed discussion of the draft on enterprises in the USSR, the decision on which was put off on Friday.

Before the session ends, parliamentarians are to discuss a number of questions, the most important of which will, undoubtedly, be the division on the government's plan for the transition of Soviet economy to a regulated market. The plan was submitted ten days ago. The congress is also to hear a report of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on the results of his visit to the United States and Canada.

Gorbachev Greetings Conveyed

LD0406083990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Now over to correspondent Igor Zorin, who is accredited to the USSR Supreme Soviet session, to find out what's happening there today:

[Zorin] Today's sitting began with Comrade Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, conveying greetings to the deputies from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who is in the United States, and with whom Comrade Lukyanov has spoken by telephone. The president conveyed his wish that the deputies work hard during this final week of the session, which has been going on for several months now, and said that he would address the session one day this week to report on the outcome of his visit to the United States and on the forthcoming meeting of the Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact participant countries.

There are 389 deputies at the session—a quorum in each of the chambers. Deputy Likhanov spoke for one minute, calling upon the deputies to honor the memory of the victims of the tragic blast on the oil product pipeline near Ufa one year ago. [passage omitted]

Lukyanov Opens Session

LD0406102190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Report from the 4 June session of the USSR Supreme Soviet by commentator Olga Vasilenko]

[Text] [Vasilenko] A joint session of the chambers is being held today. The session began with the deputies—in response to a proposal by Albert Anatoliyevich Likhanov—honoring the memory of those who perished during the tragic explosion on the Ufa-Chelyabinsk railway line one year ago. At that time, the first Congress of USSR People's deputies was being held. The great part played by literally all deputies in helping the victims is still fresh in our memories.

I shall return to the subject of the session and tell you that today is, in practice, the beginning of the final stage of the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which began back in February. Here is what Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, the chairman, had to say about this:

[Begin Lukyanov recording] We have to complete our program if possible. People are expecting this of us, the voters are expecting it. Therefore, we must work hard on the program which we had planned.

Comrades, I want to convey to you a greeting from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. We spoke to him by telephone at 2200 yesterday. He very much hopes that the session will continue all this work of ours in a constructive way and carry it out. A session of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact countries will be held immediately after his return. Therefore, maybe we should make arrangements for him to report to us immediately on the results of his visit, which, to be blunt, is very important, important in a very fundamental way, to the whole of our foreign policy, and no less important to the situation in the country and everything else. Furthermore, he should also report immediately on the results of the meeting of the Political Consultative Committee, which will be held on 7 June. You also know this from reports in the press.

Therefore, it is desirable that we should work hard and thoroughly at this final stage of the session. [end recording]

[Vasilenko] Well, we now have a rough idea of the timetable for the session. After that statement, a short intervention made by Deputy Sharin was very apt and timely. He is now acting chairman of the Committee on Defense and State Security, since Lapygin has asked to be relieved of this post. Sharin stressed the need to observe discipline in an especially firm way at this final stage. He spoke of the need for a daily quorum at the sessions. This will make it possible to vote in chambers for the adoption of various laws.

As far as today's agenda is concerned, the deputies are continuing the second reading of the law on enterprises in the USSR. This work began last week. Four of its

sections were examined and adopted on Friday. But many criticisms and proposals were made on a number of articles, in particular in section four which deals with management and self-management of enterprises. A conciliation commission got to work on these on Saturday and has now submitted a draft law which has been substantially amended. The amendments involve a precise determination of the status of subsidiary enterprises, the obligation of work collectives stemming from collective agreements to regulate questions connected with labor safety and health, and also the appointment and election of production managers at various levels.

Before the break the deputies also began an examination of the fifth section of the bill, dealing with the economic and social activities of enterprises.

Moscow TV Carries 1 Jun Supreme Soviet Session

LD0106212890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1918 GMT on 1 June begins carrying a recorded relay of the 1 June USSR Supreme Soviet joint session from the Kremlin in Moscow. Reception is good.

At 1918 GMT, the relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet begins. Deputy Vasilyev takes the floor and informs deputies of proposals by his group on the draft law on enterprises.

At 1923 GMT, Lukyanov invites various deputies to take the floor and they raise points about the amendments proposed by Vasilyev.

At 1932 GMT, Vasilyev continues answering questions from deputies. He says that the present draft law will eventually take precedence over other laws on enterprises.

At 1935 GMT, Lukyanov stresses that it is important for laws to be considered as a complex so that they do not clash.

At 1939 GMT, a deputy stresses the need for enterprises to be made responsible for the safety of their workers.

At 1940 GMT, a deputy asks about the right of an enterprise that belongs to a production association to declare independence.

At 1943 GMT, a woman deputy asks about the rights of women workers.

At 1945 GMT, a deputy stresses the need for enterprises to enhance the quality of their output. This should be reflected in the draft law.

At 1950 GMT, a question is asked about work collective councils.

At 1955 GMT, a deputy asks about pensioners' rights. Vasilyev says that the all-union legislation on pension rights will of course apply to enterprises.

At 2001 GMT, USSR Minister of Justice Yakovlev speaks of the precedence of various laws. He makes the point that normally the later bill takes precedence. He then answers various points raised by deputies regarding various paragraphs in the draft law.

At 2009 GMT, Lukyanov hands the floor to Novotnyy, the director of a production association, who has come all the way from Novosibirsk to take part in the debate. He notes that the measures that have been taken so far to stabilize the economy have not been successful. He stresses what is necessary in his view for progress in the economy. He says the present draft law under consideration will make an important practical contribution to improving the economy. The law should be adopted, he says.

At 2016 GMT, Gritsenko says the bill should be adopted and, if necessary, adjustments made to it in a year's time.

At 2020 GMT, Lukyanov proposes a vote on the bill, section by section. First he takes a vote on the proposed title of the law. Since there are not enough Soviet of Nationalities deputies present, he takes a vote on approving the title by a simple majority without a quorum. The measure is approved. The title of the law is then adopted by another vote: 329 for, 5 against, 2 abstentions, 336 total votes cast.

At 2025 GMT, announcer says that the deputies then debated and voted on the law article by article. The debate on the law will continue on Monday.

At 2026 GMT, the USSR Supreme Soviet recorded relay ends.

Vasiliev Stresses Law Would Bring 'Independence'

LD0106213290 Moscow TASS in English 1618 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary corresondents Andrey Orlov and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—The Soviet Parliamentary today started the second reading of a bill on enterprises, designed to create equal economic conditions for various enterprises, including state-owned, leased, collective, cooperative and individual.

About one half of its 40 articles have already been approved.

Presenting the bill to parliament, Boris Vasiliev, deputy chairman of the Commission for Industry, emphasised that the law would substantially expand the independence of enterprises, which is vitally necessary during the transition to market relations.

The law would envisage a common indicator of the results of economic activity for all enterprises—profit—and single-channel deductions to the state budget.

Any settlements, involving revenues obtained by enterprises, with ministries and departments are ruled out. A single system for the establishment of an enterprise, its registration, charter approval, reorganisation and liquidation is envisaged.

Under the law, enterprises would have the right to sell their products at prices they themselves fix or agree with other parties. State price controls will be allowed only on products manufactured by enterprises that enjoy a monopoly on the market.

Interaction with government bodies will rest on a contractual basis. The ability to borrow money by issuing bonds and obligations will be expanded.

In matters of material and technical supply, the stake rests on market relations. The bill expands the rights of work collectives in establishing new businesses in order to develop entrepreneurship and fight monopolism. Work collectives will be granted equal rights with owner representatives in controlling property of the enterprise.

The bill is scheduled to be adopted at the joint sitting of the two houses next Monday, June 4.

Yazov Expresses Apologies for Afghan War

LD0106200290 Moscow TASS in English 1930 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov has apologised for actions by his predecessors and expressed profound condolences to the mothers of Soviet soldiers who perished in Afghanistan.

Marshal Yazov and other officials met the mothers at the Women's Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet today.

A total of 14,163 Soviet troops died or were missing in action during the war in Afghanistan. The mothers demanded guarantees that this will never happen again.

Mothers, representatives of ministries and departments and people's deputies of the USSR discussed providing real assistance for war invalids and families of those who perished in the war.

Political & Social

Yeltsin-Gorbachev Compromise Viewed as Possible

PM0406085890 Rome AVANTI! in Italian 30 May 90 p 3

[Telephone interview with Yevgeniy Ambartsumov, deputy to the Russian parliament, by Libero Lizzadri; date not given]

[Text] We telephoned Professor Yevgeniy Ambartsumov, deputy to the parliament of the Russian Republic, to seek his comments on the news of Boris Yeltsin's election as president. Ambartsumov, a CPSU member, was elected within the "Democratic Russia" group, led by Yeltsin. Ambartsumov will now probably be a member of the "Democratic Russia" delegation to the roundtable proposed by Yeltsin which should be attended by representatives of all groups.

[Lizzadri] How do you assess Yeltsin's victory?

[Ambartsumov] It is not a personal success or a success for an individual group, but a success for the people because Yeltsin's candidacy was supported by the entire people: If it had been a direct election Yeltsin would have obtained 80 percent of the votes. He is not implicated in any financial scandals or corruption cases, unlike other leaders. And at this time, when there is a shortage of goods in the stores, his victory has been welcomed by people from both the political and the ethical viewpoint. Furthermore, Yeltsin's victory alleviates the tension in the country. The most important thing is that his victory was a victory for democracy. In past weeks Yeltsin has been accused of being a populist—and partly, he is—and of being a reactionary, which is entirely untrue. The program that he presented is a democratic program; he has said that he wants to consult with all groups and to govern with consensus, to form a great Russian government of national concord. And the fact that all democrats support him speaks for itself. The time has passed when we used to criticize him for his political faux pas, his misstatements, which he has eliminated from his program: He has spoken as a shrewd and responsible politician.

[Lizzadri] Has his election weakened Gorbachev?

[Ambartsumov] In my opinion, Gorbachev was wrong to become involved in political wrangling and to attack Yeltsin. Just yesterday he spoke in the Kremlin with the "Russian Communists" group (which does not include all communists) and tried to compromise Yeltsin's chances. But his move had the opposite effect. The deputies do not want to be subjected to pressures, and there was an increase in the number of votes for Yeltsin. Having said that, it should be added that, in my opinion, a compromise between Yeltsin and Gorbachev is possible because their conflict is mainly of a personal nature and stems partly from Gorbachev's excessively emotional response to some of Yeltsin's remarks. But Gorbachev could set aside personal issues and find scope for cooperation with Yeltsin. In this way, above all, he would receive through Yeltsin legitimization for his economic reform blueprint—with whose general ideas he too agrees, even though he disagrees with some details. Above all, Gorbachev could present Yeltsin with an assessment of the economic reform situation. In other words, it is in Gorbachev's interests to cooperate with Yeltsin in order to gain support for his policy. And Yeltsin does not hold rigid stances. He will be putting forward a Gorbachev supporter as prime minister of the Russian Republic...

[Lizzadri] Vlasov?

[Ambartsumov] No, not Vlasov, because he is implicated in the failure of the economy—even though it is not his fault. But there are other Gorbachev supporters capable of taking on this post. Today, on a proposal from Yeltsin, there will be a roundtable with representatives of the 27 parliamentary groups; then there will be another involving all representatives of the regions and autonomous republics. Of course such a large meeting cannot decide on an agreement, but it will prepare for a more select meeting to be held immediately afterward.

[Lizzadri] What about foreign policy?

[Ambartsumov] Yeltsin does not differ from Gorbachev, though he is more determined in his quest for cooperation with neighbors—with Japan, for instance. But it is not true that he has said that he is willing to cede the southern Kuril Islands to Japan: He merely proposed an examination of the possibility of free zones in which our sons, in 20 years' time—when, hopefully, the border issue will be less acute than it is now—new forms of cooperation could emerge through open zones and so forth [sentence as published].

[Lizzadri] What does Yeltsin's victory signify from the viewpoint of relations with the Union's other republics?

[AMbartsumov] It is not true, as Gorbachev has alleged, that he will cause the Union to explode: Yeltsin wants Russia to stay in the Union, that there be direct accords between Russia and the other republics, and especially that exchanges take place on the basis of world prices.

[Lizzadri] But will this not harm the other republics, starting with those of the Baltic?

[Ambartsumov] What we are saying is not that this must happen tomorrow, but that it is necessary to examine gradual mechanisms for achieving this kind of exchange without sudden shocks.

Yakovlev Views Democracy, Economic Freedom

PM0106123990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by Aleksandr Yakovlev: "On the Threshold of Sharp Changes"—footnote to article states: "This article by A.N. Yakovlev, member of the USSR Presidential Council and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is based on his speech at the 30 May 1990 international conference on 'Finance, Investment, and Trade With the Soviet Union' in Moscow"]

[Text] We are all thinking about the future and our prospects. And not just about our economic future but, I would say, our philosophical future too. Our huge country is making a dramatic turnaround in its development which, in any event, will be reflected in its own destiny and in its relations with the outside world—and consequently, in world development.

At this turning point there are many pitfalls, obvious and hidden dangers. But there is also immense creative potential.

History moves in periods.

There is the relatively short but very intensive period of the acquisition of freedom, when people and society choose their future for many years and even decades ahead and lay its foundations.

And there are protracted periods, seen as a time of outward stability, when within the framework of this choice society and people rid themselves of social illusions in favor of realities and attempt not only to reject the negative past but to conquer themselves, when a new system is created and its potential is tested to the limits beyond which the system is exhausted.

The Soviet Union is now at the stage of a new qualitative choice. This is a great, diverse, and rich country. The situation in many respects is difficult. The processes in it are subject to the strong inertia of the past. A fundamental turnaround was made in April 1985. But the fundamentally new annals of perestroyka are starting only now. And this watershed is the transition to a market economy.

I say this in order to note yet again that, in a certain sense, perestroyka is only just beginning. Everything that has been done, despite the revolutionary importance of what has been achieved, has been no more than the overture, approach, and entree to what will have to be done now. In the years that have elapsed we had to see the problems in full and analyze them honestly and without prejudice. The sectors of society active in political and civic life had to do this work independently, make their own decisions, and employ their personal resolve. Now the moment of truth, the moment of action, has arrived. We must ensure that, overcoming florid emotions, evil egoism, and arrogant feverishness, we reach commonsense positions—neither to the left nor to the right.

Any practical work requires realism. Economic relations do so all the more. It is for the sake of this realism, and not to prolong old ideological disputes or start new ones, that I will say the following. Reality is more complex than mechanical schemes. In acquiring a new quality of society, we are doing so on the basis of our adherence to the socialist ideal since mankind has carried with it the values of justice through the millennia and created around them everything that marks out modern civilization.

How then do the ideas and practice of perestroyka differ from our own past?

First, society is resolutely and categorically rejecting everything that in its essence or form is incompatible with natural morality. Of course we cannot remake the past, but we have to reinterpret it. We must avoid the mind-set and practice of the rudiments of this past—

whether they stemmed from the country's low general level of development, indecent ideological zeal, the exaggeration of external threats, and real difficulties (and there were more than enough of them for several generations), or whether they were dictated by someone's evil will. That is why we condemn Stalinism as a phenomenon and a particular state of social institutions, affairs, and morality.

Second, we are using as the most important guidelines and criteria for all our future activity not abstract formulas—even if they are attractive in themselves—but the specific welfare of people and society today or in the very near future. The elevation of the individual. Freedom, democracy, glasnost, and firm moral foundations. Providing people with everything they need to live. Creating unlimited opportunities for sensible choice and self-realization.

Third, the implementation of the socialist ideal is seen not in opposition to the rest of world experience. Any singling out of the socialist trend from world development or opposition to it is unacceptable. It is part and parcel of the civilized process. Its future lies in the economy, culture, science, technology, the way of life, forms of social organization, and everything—it lies in a strong interconnection and growing integration with world processes. And needless to say, with all the conclusions that follow from that for foreign policy, legal regulation, forms of economic management, and the entire "technology" of society's life in general.

I would stress that all this is not the result merely of subjective factors. These ideas, feelings, and aspirations have been hard won by society, which is ripe for change and demands it. The best proof of that is the fact that perestroyka is finding the going difficult, encountering acute discussions and clashes, and overcoming very real and very serious obstacles.

The political reform implemented in 1989-1990 has pursued several aims.

It took a step from glasnost toward real, institutionalized democracy, from the administrative-edict system—the tone of which was set by the party-state apparatus and the leaders of industrial monopolies—to a rule-of-law system of power where there is a clear-cut demarcation of functions and supreme authority belongs to the soviets at corresponding levels. Political reform is gradually dismantling overly bureaucratic structures. Although valuable in itself, it should nonetheless provide an impetus for the implementation of economic reform too. And the main thing is that it should lay the foundations for a secular, rule-of-law, democratic state. What has been done during this period and in what way?

Much has been done and little has been done. Much—if we are talking about how far society has left its very recent past behind. Everything has changed—above all, people's awareness is changing, albeit slowly. The monopolies on thinking, on the truth, and on the right to assess things and make proposals have been broken. I think that all this is irreversible. We are really looking differently now at ourselves, at our work and problems, at the outside world, and at our place in it.

But, at the same time, we are coming to realize just how much remains to be done. Here is one example that is very close to home. Joint ventures. To ensure their healthy functioning we needed a law on ownership—it was adopted quite recently. There is no law on enterprise. We still lack laws on land ownership, on foreign-exchange operations, on the market—we lack the market itself—and on much else besides. And it is impossible to create these laws in such a short time just as it is impossible to create them in the abstract, in a priori fashion, and divorced from the processes in life itself—these processes are only just getting under way.

We are only just learning about political culture even in the political reform—which is so far ahead of the economic reform. The activity of the newly elected soviets is being organized. People, groups, parties, and organizations are settling down and learning to work under the new conditions. The federation will have to be reorganized and renewed, a new union treaty concluded, and a new constitution adopted.

Society is moving forward quite quickly. The institution of the presidency—which is entirely new for our country and its political traditions—has been set up. This step is aimed above all at consolidating society and all its forces on the basis of democratic development. Democracy is the key to everything. It creates the possibility for a historic turnaround in the fate of the country and its peoples. Very many things prevented us from making this turnaround before. But now it has become imperative for further development.

What is holding up the democratic process now, what barriers stand in its way? There is definite resistance, of course. But it is not the main thing or the most threatening thing. There is resistance from the forces of inertia and habit. This is more serious but surmountable. I would like to mention systemic obstacles.

The buildup of democracy in our way of life is being curbed and hampered most of all by the continuing **lack of economic freedom.** Both people and collectives still depend on the state when it comes to the most important, determining matters. Their autonomy, independence, and sovereignty are still substantially limited in practice.

And that is why the determining aim of the economic reform and the transition to the market is to make a breakthrough to economic freedom. This breakthrough is all the more important and necessary because the lack of economic freedom is not yet felt in society as clearly and strongly as the lack of of freedom in other spheres. And, at the same time, without economic freedom there will be no reliable foundations or realistic basis for political democracy.

I see the reason for the persistence of the lack of economic freedom as lying above all in the high level of freeloading, which undermines the motivation for work and objectively allows people to live without thinking too much about the material sources of their lives and activity. The standard and quality of life are mostly divorced from the results of the work of a given person or given collective. And this gap has to be overcome—which, incidentally, is the aim of the transition to a socially justified market.

The maintenance of this situation for a historically long period running into decades is largely responsible for the fact that the habit of thinking realistically and rationally has been, as it were, extirpated from the country's centuries-long cultural and psychological legacy. Together with a social awareness muddled with all kinds of myths and stereotypes, this is now objectively hampering the development of democratic processes. It hampers it in that it makes possible superficial thinking, irresponsible demands, and total license in actions, and all these may result in some people becoming disillusioned with democratic norms and institutions. And that is dangerous.

We now need not just to develop, strengthen, and cherish democracy in every possible way but also to make demands of it and place it on a firm footing of realism and the law in every possible way. Democracy, perestroyka, and the market demand rational thinking and action. Needless to say, we cannot go to the other extreme and indulge in empty rationalism or short-sighted pragmatism—these trends exist too.

The buildup of democratic potential is now coming up against the acuteness of **interethnic relations.** Let me be blunt, a great deal in this area came as an unpleasant surprise to us. The problems built up over the decades and, when perestroyka removed our previous fear and muteness, they burst forth. Nor do I rule out the possibility that some people are now deliberately exacerbating them.

I think that this explosion of national feelings reflects not only past shortcomings and pomposity, and not only the objective difficulties of the overall situation in the country. The formation of genuine democracy and a modern market economy has had to overcome nationalism everywhere. Feudalism—be it the classic European variety or our own departmental variety—objectively alienates peoples and even individual cities and oblasts, erecting barriers of economic boundaries between them. In time the market will remove these boundaries, but to do this it has to achieve a certain level of development.

Naturally, all this affects economic relations with the outside world. We have smashed—although perhaps not completely as yet—our former mentality of autarkic existence. We are subjectively striving for and in need of the most active ties with the outside world. We realize how useful these ties could be in every respect.

But in many ways I think, society and its economic structures are not yet prepared for these ties. I will not discuss the purely professional matters to which your conference is devoted. But it is quite clear that when the old economic system is being destroyed and the new system has not yet been created, it is a difficult time for economic relations. When many vitally important political, legal, administrative, and arbitration structures are still in the process of formation, this too is a difficult time for honest business relations.

Here too we cannot get away merely with noble aspirations. The commercial sluggishness of which Soviet businessmen have often, and rightly, been accused is not just a reflection of ingrained bureaucracy. Today it is also a reflection of the complex domestic processes in the country and its economy. It is a fact, and it is obvious.

Something else must also be said. The decades of confrontation, cold war, hostility, and mutual suspicion cannot fail to have left their mark. People's mentality has become adapted to this existence and has been considerably crippled by this way of life. We also often encounter diverse manifestations of the consequences of this and we will go on doing so for some time. This too is part and parcel of today's complex realities.

Nonetheless, the choice has been made, and there is no going back to the old ways just as there is no real rational alternative to perestroyka. We firmly intend to adhere to this choice, although of course, this does not mean that we now have clear answers to all questions. That is by no means the case, and sometimes is not the case at all. We will have to learn many things as we go along.

Clearly, we cannot achieve social renewal and fundamental improvements in the economy by using partial and half-baked measures. We need profound and fundamental changes in the entire system of economic "ground rules." But politics is the art of the possible. And in every respect ours is a country where direct transfers of foreign experience will be unsuitable. We need to take what is best and has proved its worth, but we must seek our own ways of utilizing this experience. We must beat our own path in life—a path that may even be different in different parts of the country.

We must pay tribute to those Western businessmen who are striving to expand relations with us in these difficult conditions. I think that I can mainly understand their risk and difficulties—just as I can understand the potential advantages. I am sure that the progress of perestroyka, the economic reform, and the transition to the market will result in a situation in which only natural problems and nothing more than that will remain. I believe this.

But I am also sure that not only our country, but the entire world is on the brink of a breakthrough. It seems that people and mankind—to speak in a broad philosophical sense—have realized that disunity has thrown up dangers that could result in universal annihilation. It seems that people have realized their primordial kinship.

Today it is no longer enough to state our adherence to peace and disarmament, it is not even enough to cut—albeit by half or more—our arsenals of nuclear and other weapons or to scrap them altogether. This is all necessary, but it is not enough. We also need to create structures capable of effectively solving the problems of social and historical development in the general interest.

In criticizing ourselves, we can also see the diversity of the economic and other motivations of our foreign partners, real and potential. Some are drawn merely by the promise of profit, its size, and the timescale in which it can be made. Others show an interest in cooperation but are scared by uncertainty and risk. However, there is an increasing number who can see, feel, and realize that firm and deep economic ties with the Soviet Union are also an important aspect of building the new world of the future.

The mutual breakthrough toward each other now is particularly strong and intensive. I think that a lot of reasons have come together here. There is a natural human and political interest after decades of hostility and alienation. There is weariness with confrontation and a realization not only of its dangers but of its futility, emptiness, and inability to respond constructively to any question. There is the drama of perestroyka and the opportunities it is opening up. There is the desire to find out something new and useful for yourself from other people. There is the satisfaction that comes from mutual discovery and recognition, from the recognition of our ability to do things which even a few years ago would have been considered nothing more than hopeless fantasy.

The sense of perestroyka is visible in all this:

To reliably launch the country onto the track of accelerating economic progress.

To work out in practice an effective development model in line with present-day internal and external realities.

To enter into extensive international cooperation in our own interests and in the interests of all of civilization.

To promote in every possible way the creation of the conditions for a qualitatively new world which will be built jointly and in unison rather than in isolation and confrontation.

This is a beautiful dream for all social romantics, but in our time it has every chance of becoming a reality worthy of people.

Yakovlev Sees Market Economy as 'Breakthrough'

LD0106132390 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] A member of the Presidential Council of the Soviet Union, Aleksandr Yakovlev, has said that perestroyka in this country is only beginning. Interviewed by the press, Yakovlev said that transition to a market would spell a breakthrough towards economic freedom. At the same time Yakovlev, a secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, warned against copying foreign economic models. He said that all the best must be borrowed and at the same time one's own ways of using that experience should be looked for on the basis of commitment to the socialist idea.

Press Given Information for Covering Congress

LD3105153290 Moscow TASS in English 1449 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Moscow May 31 TASS—The Russian Communist Party conference will open on June 19 and the 28th Soviet Communist Party Congress will begin on July 2 in Moscow, journalists were told at the Foreign Ministry's Press Centre today.

A press centre at the Russian conference will work from June 12, and at the 28th Congress from June 25.

Briefings, news conferences, statements by delegates and meetings at the request of journalists will be organised before the opening of the two party forums.

No foreign correspondents will be allowed into sittings of the conference and the congress. Their work will be transmited live to the Ministry Press Centre. A communications centre will also operate there.

The accreditation of journalists arriving to cover the Russian party conference will begin on June 4, and for the party congress on June 16.

Accreditation requests will be accepted until June 12 for the conference and until June 25 for the congress. They are to be sent through Soviet embassies to the following address: 4 Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, 103786, Telex 411586 MFAPCSU.

The applications should contain the following information: first and last names, date and place of birth, nationality, title of news organisation.

Four photographs (3x4 cm) are required for accreditation to the two forums.

Information about the results of accreditation can be obtained through Soviet embassies or directly from press centres.

Foreign journalists are expected to pay for their stay in Moscow. Accommodation can be arranged via Intourist.

More Delegates Elected for 28th CPSU Congress

PM0106120190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Elected to the Congress"]

[Text] 30 May—More and more new names are being announced in the course of the elections of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress.

Moscow. The capital's CPSU organization has completed the elections of delegates to the communist' upcoming all-Union forum. Some 270 of 279 delegates have been elected to date as a result of two rounds of direct, secret, and multicandidate voting in party districtsand also of elections to vacant seats at rayon party conferences.

They include M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and party Central Committee Politburo members N.I. Ryzhkov, E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, V.A. Kryuchkov, and Yu.D. Maslyukov.

A considerable number of party committee secretaries of various levels, economic leaders, representatives of the intelligentsia, specialists, and employees have been elected. They include Professor A.M. Yemelyanov from Moscow State University; V.B. Nosov, general director of the "No. 1 State Bearing Plant" Production Association; Yu.V. Lavrenev, engineer at a locomotive depot, and many others.

Leningrad. Five communists on average stood for each of the 147 delegate's seats to the 28th CPSU Congress from the Leningrad party organization. This also predetermined the intensity of the acute and uncompromising struggle during the elections. Whom did they decide to send to the party congress? The following will go to Moscow: V.I. Grigoryev, driver at the "Sovavto-Leningrad" Association; Yu.V. Trusov, general director at the "Ptitseprom" Association; and B.V. Gidaspov, first secretary of the CPSU Obkom and Gorkom [oblast and city party committees]. Professor A.A. Denisov from the Polytechnical Institute, USSR People's Artist V.I. Strzhelchik, and engineer Yu.Yu. Boldyrev also won a majority at the elections.

Voronezh. Some 52 delegates will represent the Voronezh Oblast party organization at the forum for the country's communists. The following were elected by a majority vote: V.G. Gubin, leader of a machine part department; N.G. Filimonov, chairman of the kolkhoz [collective farm] named for the 20th CPSU Congress; V.A. Volgin, party committee secretary at the Komintern Heavy Excavator Production Association; and others.

Elista. The communists of the Kalmyk Oblast party organization made their choice during voting for delegates to the CPSU congress. Their emissaries include D.N. Kugultinov, republic people's poet; V.A. Zakharov, CPSU Obkom first secretary; and others. The elections within party electoral districts took place on a multicandidate basis.

Tashkent. Dozens of progressive workers and representatives of Uzbekistan's intelligentsia have been named as delegates to the coming congress. This high honor was accorded to A.V. Glubokiy, leader of a team of shaft sinkers at the "Tashmetrostroy" Trust; actress G.M. Dzhamilovaya; and I.A. Karimov, Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee first secretary. More than 100 people will represent the republic at the congress.

Khabarovsk. The progress of perestroyka and the renewal of political organs' and party organizations' activity, along with the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th CPSU Congress and the draft party statutes were discussed at length at a party conference in the Far Eastern Military DistricThe conference also elected delegates to the CPSU congress. Those to whom communists gave preference include D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister.

Government Moves Toward Closing Chernobyl

PM0106103590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Second Edition p 3

[Report by correspondent M. Odinets: "Step Toward the Closure of the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Station"]

[Text] Kiev, 31 May—After representations by the [Ukrainian] republic's government, the USSR Council of Ministers has set up a commission to elaborate by 1 October this year a program of work to take the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station [AES] power units out of service. It is headed by Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers Chairman V. Gladush.

The commission has been instructed to examine the solution of problems connected with ensuring the social protection and rights of Chernobyl AES workers, the nuclear and radiation safety of facilities in the station zone, and the burial of radioactive waste.

Gorbachev Greets First Leaseholders' Congress

LD0106183190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1415 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 1 Jun (TASS)—The role of leasing as an important trend in developing independent economic management and the interest of the working people in high results of production was stressed by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev in his greetings to the First Congress of USSR Leaseholders and Entrepreneurs, which opened in Moscow today.

The delegates to the congress are to tackle organizational issues, add to the charter of the union, and analyze the prospects for developing leaseholding and enterprise in the country.

Leasehold relations now unite 6.5 million citizens working in industry, agriculture, the domestic services sector, trade, construction, science, and culture.

Yazov Addresses Mothers of Afghan War Dead

LD0106230490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] In the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Women and the Protection of the Family, Motherhood and Children, the mothers of soldiers who

died in Afghanistan had a meeting today with USSR Defense Minister Yazov and other officials. [passage omitted]

[Unidentified correspondent] The present defense minister cannot be held responsible for the actions of his predecessors; nevertheless, he did offer profound condolences.

[Begin Yazov recording] Thus, in the ten years of that war, we not only lost in some degree the prestige that the Soviet Union and its Armed Forces enjoyed after the victorious Great Patriotic War, but also in some degree inflicted terrible pain on the families and friends, our own Soviet people. With hindsight, we are obliged to offer apologies once again and regret that it happened. [end recording] [passage omitted] [video shows weeping mothers; Yazov speaking to them]

Moscow TV Reports on Problems in Republics

LD3005120890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 30 May 90

[Text] A plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia has decided to sack the editorial board of the paper CINA. The decision was motivated by the fact that the editorial board of CINA and its party organization supported the independent Communist Party of Latvia and in essence have escaped from the influence of the central committee.

A correspondent of INTERFAX agency reports on the complex situation in Moldavia and the fact that Snegur, the chairman of the supreme soviet of Moldavia, has requested the parliament of the republic to ensure his personal security, speaks for itself.

At the congress of the Social Democrats of the Ukraine, there has been a split into two independent political currents. Nevertheless both groups have given themselves the task of the renaissance of the republic as a sovereign, independent power.

CPSU Democratic Platform Supporters Meet

LD0306162190 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Text] Leningrad June 3 TASS—It is only on the path towards democratic socialism that the desire of the Soviet people for a dignified way of life can be fully met, Leningrad communists who support the democratic platform within the Soviet Communist party said in the concluding statement of their second conference, which ended here today.

During the two-day conference, 367 delegates from party organisations of enterprises and districts of Leningrad worked out the programme that they are going to present to the regional party conference next week and to the forthcoming 28th congress of the Soviet Communist Party.

It was proposed to hold a party referendum on the eve of the congress to poll opinions concerning the party structure, name and property.

The main objective of radical political reform, the statement stresses, is the transition to a parliamentary, multiparty and law-governed state.

The place and role played by the party and other public organisations in society must be determined by their prestige and mass support.

Favouring the transition to a market economy, delegates noted the importance of adopting adequate legislation to guarantee minimum incomes, taking into account the price index, as well as adopting a number of other measures of social protection.

It was stressed that a new union treaty should be signed, laying down the rules of admission to and secession or expulsion of republics from the union.

The basic principles of relationships between the nations of our country, it was said at the conference, are equitability, sovereignty and the right of nations to self-determination.

TASS Director Ponders Media Changes

90US0951A Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 May 90 p 2

[Interview with Leonid Kravchenko, TASS general director, by Yu. Nekrasov: "The Fact: Destroyer or Creator?"]

[Text] [Nekrasov] So it has turned out, Leonid Petrovich, that in our day the mass media, the main forum for discussion of perestroyka, has itself become the object of tough, unyielding discussion. The range of opinions is immense: from asserting that the press is all but an engine for perestroyka to accusing our colleagues of all kinds of poor coordination and wheel spinning. And such various perceptions of a flow of information that is literally gushing over our readers and listeners never ceases to amaze us.

[Kravchenko] I personally would be surprised by something else: General rapture about the information boom. Society has been on a carefully measured information ration for too long for it to painlessly absorb the "abundance" that is raining down. I do not think that even we journalists were really prepared for such an abrupt elimination of the restrictions. In any case, I dare say that we have far from a complete idea of our audience. And we are just learning to predict its reaction. We will put aside the orthodox for whom a truthful word sticks in their throats. We will address the main mass of those for whom we are working—honest and sincere people. Far from all of them are in a state of euphoria about the fact that they no longer have to search for voices in the night, "from abroad," as it were, in order to find news. All they have to do is open the newspaper.

[Nekrasov] I would say "hot off the press"....

[Kravchenko] There you have it. And the hot news it contains is far from always joyous. And we must get used to that. For the people, especially the older generation, are used to something else. Guardians of official optimism, despite their own wishes, have taught people to see behind the alarming words something more than has been said. When certain imperfections are noted, for instance, it is taken to mean that things are bad all over. And here it is in black and white—the situation is critical. Incidentally, the bitter lesson of Chernobyl is that the coverage of this tragedy was, one hopes, one of the last remnants of that half-truth that is worse than any lie.

[Nekrasov] But if the essence of our work amounted to the registration of precise facts I think the very discussion of the influence of the media on social processes would seem insignificant....

[Kravchenko] Naturally. It is not enough to report one event or another. Dispassionate reporting can also play a destructive role. For instance, if you constantly remind a person of his physical ailments. After all, this would also be the truth. The truth, which certainly does not add to the unfortunate person's cheerfulness. It would be another thing if you informed him of how his comrade in misfortune had found his place in life. The truth is the basis of our trade, the main tool of our production. And it should be a tool of creation and not destruction.

[Nekrasov] Incidentally, Leonid Petrovich, our choice of you to address MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA readers today was dictated not only by the fact that you are the leader of the largest information agency in the world. In STROITELNAYA GAZETA you traversed the path from rank-and-file worker to editor-in-chief. In the first half of the eighties you were in charge of TRUD and then you were deputy chairman of USSR Gosteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting], and I am convinced that it is no accident that your employment in these mass media coincides with significant steps to meet the reader, viewer, and listener half way. We will not discuss your work in Gosteleradio (although it is remarkable because of the appearance of a number of shows without which modern television would have been unthinkable today). We will not discuss this if only because this was a time of renewal about which generations of journalists had dreamed. But here we have TRUD, 1980-85. The dry organ of the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Trade Union Council] is suddenly becoming the most read newspaper. Its circulation has skyrocketed from 9 to 19 million. What is the root of this?

[Kravchenko] A large question obviously requires a large answer. And that is what it would be if we were to discuss in detail the new columns, sections, and so forth. This, however, is not the essence. And therefore I will be brief. We tried to live with the aspirations of the reader, to protect his rights and legitimate interests with all the means at our disposal, and to oppose arbitrary action.

[Nekrasov] In other words you fulfilled the main trade union function. That would seem to be logical and simple. But the trade unions, at least at that time, seemed fairly pale as defenders of man. And the position of the leading trade union newspaper, as far as I know, was not always understood by the publisher. For the sword of Damocles frequently hung over the head of the chief.

[Kravchenko] It did. And for that very reason. But, believe me, one is reminded much more frequently of something else. What can compare to a letter from a person who has been supported by the newspaper at a difficult time? And there were many hundreds of letters like this. And the TRUD collective was not simply consolidated—it was sustained by a common cause! And together we acquired skills that are especially necessary today. Together we learned about the creative truth and together we looked for new paths to the reader. A happy time!

[Nekrasov] That is said not without sadness....

[Kravchenko] But certainly not because it was better in the past. I am an optimist. I do not simply believe—I know: The best is still ahead.

[Nekrasov] Here—in TASS?

[Kravchenko] I can guess the reasons for your perplexity. And perhaps I would have shared it a couple of years ago. But what do we journalists who are not directly involved in the work of TASS actually know about it? The fact that the newspapers receive from TASS information which, while it is very important, is far from always the most readable, that this information sometimes, if it is late, can "ruin" the issue, that TASS is the supplier of official information....

[Nekrasov] ....which publications from the central down to rayon level must reprint.

[Kravchenko] And you call this knowledge? Well, the Telegraph Agency of the Soviet Union is indeed an official institution—under the USSR Council of Ministers. Naturally, it is a distributor of information coming from the government. But, after all, the essence of the perestroyka processes is that there should be no contradictions between the voice of the government and the voice of the people. And there is one path to this—through absolutely truthful, prompt provision of information to the masses about the most important events in the country and the world. But the main thing is never to compromise the truth, even if some people do not like it very much.

But it is an anachronism to reduce all TASS functions to mere reproduction of truthful reports. If this were so our agency would hardly enjoy such authority abroad. TASS information is disseminated in eight languages through 100 agencies. It is constantly being received in 130

countries. If one were to sum up the daily TASS output it would amount to 750 newspaper columns. Could a government, even of a country so immense and rich in events as ours, really be the only source of such a large avalanche of news? This information conveyor flows in two direction—from the USSR abroad and from abroad to the USSR.

[Nekrasov] From what you have already said it is clear that a colossal amount of labor from an immense detachment of journalists stands behind all this. And nonetheless when information labeled TASS appears in the newspaper the reader perceives it as the official opinion of the authorities.

[Kravchenko] Unfortunately, this evaluation also accompanies materials which by virtue of their content can by no means be called governmental. And when they use the common phrase "TASS is authorized to report," the author of this information is far from always the government as a whole. And certainly not TASS. Here the agency is only an intermediary. And it is quite absurd, in my view, when our correspondent gives information, say, about cultural life, on behalf of the entire agency. Incidentally, this happens frequently because of the newspapermen who leave the TASS symbol intact but for some reason remove the name of the writer. I am categorically against this kind of depersonalization and I do not see any reason to conceal the authorship by the organ or department that provides the information. TASS is indeed frequently authorized to make one announcement or another. So why not state outright who authorized TASS to do this?

[Nekrasov] But when you yourself were a newspaperman did you not have occasion to use the expression "TASS language" and by no means as a compliment?

[Kravchenko] I did. Indeed, because of some established tradition which nobody understood, for many years TASS workers seemed to deliberately limit their creative and lexical arsenal. I believe that today this is becoming a part of the past. There are no specific, purely TASS restrictions on normal journalistic creativity. I think the reader has also sensed certain changes here. Of course the process of professional improvement is such that it has only one reference point—the initial one. We are doing and will continue to do everything we can to make the TASS symbol an emblem of quality.

[Nekrasov] Let us return, however, to the official reports. For even today because of them our newspapers frequently all look the same.

[Kravchenko] I will say at the outset that I am a confirmed opponent of all kinds of newspaper "compulsories." But for the sake of fairness I will note that the nature of certain news items that are transmitted through our channels is such that, in my view, no self-respecting publication could run them. But, I repeat, I am in favor of complete emancipation in this issue. The editorial board should have the final say. And as a regular reader of MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA I welcome the newspaper's decisions not to publish official reports that come in so late that they threaten to keep the issue from making its deadline. Our duty is not only to convey information promptly but also to do everything we can to make sure that it is important even if it is not especially marked.

[Nekrasov] What do you want for yourself on our professional holiday, what do you dream about?

[Kravchenko] What can one dream about on a professional holiday if not the health of the matter entrusted to him? Recently TASS has been well supplied and it continues to receive the most modern equipment. And we are not speaking about "patching up holes" or even about modernization. We are speaking about a principally new technical level of our service. I will not tire the reader with a list of our acquisitions; I will simply mention their strategic goal. We want to create a TASS data bank—a heretofore unprecedented storehouse of the most diverse information from practically all branches of knowledge.

[Nekrasov] But still a "bank" is a commercial concept....

[Kravchenko] Of course it is commercial. In our age of economic accountability it is time to stop shying away from this word. Of course what is in the bank will not be available only to TASS. It is on a commercial basis that it will be made available to those who apply to us.

[Nekrasov] I can foresee a reproach: "A government agency is gaining a monopoly on information. And this under the conditions of a multiparty system."

[Kravchenko] We do not intend to make any preliminary restrictions on our potential partners. Not on enterprises, organizations, or political parties. Ultimately, precise information, the truth, is something we will never have to fear if we are convinced of the rightness of our cause.

[Nekrasov] But people must also want to hear the truth. The battles we see in rallies these days remind one of debates among deaf people. The sides hear only themselves.

[Kravchenko] To our misfortune. I hope it is only temporary and the society is only a mirror reflecting the propaganda of the recent past. And it, this propaganda (including in the mass media), has been aimed at some "average" Soviet person who does not exist in nature. We have already said that the public reaction to the information boom was largely unexpected. It was unexpected because we were not used to predicting and hearing the opinion of the audience. But we want them to learn to hear us instantly, "right off the bat." This is why each time in TASS we try to anticipate: On what kind of soil will this grain of information fall, precisely what will sprout from it? A good study of the consumer of our information is not a whim—it is an essential need. I am convinced, however, depending on the diversity of

demand of those for whom we are working, one thing links them all together: reliability, competence, and candor are the universal triune "key" to man's mind.

[Nekrasov] "And consider refined precision to be the only virtue," said the poet.

[Kravchenko] True. But that is certainly not all. A civic position—a position and not an ambition—is what the journalist does not have the right to hide from the reader. Unless this position is revealed, our word itself appears degraded. And it is absolutely not necessary for everybody or even the majority to like this position. It is important for them to believe that you are sincere. I note that the leader needs this confidence to no less an extent. I will not say frequently, but sometimes I have had to resort to measures that are not the most popular. In one creative collective a principally very democratic tradition whereby the best work was determined through a general vote led to a separation between "ours" and "not ours." Well, as a result the microclimate—you understand... It was necessary to let the general meeting have only an advisory vote. And the final decision was the prerogative of the editorial board. It would appear to be an authoritarian step but it evoked no protest from the people. And this was because, calmly, without unnecessary sarcasm, I helped them to look at themselves from the outside.

[Nekrasov] But in general do you favor authoritarian or democratic methods of leadership?

[Kravchenko] Undoubtedly, democratic. Otherwise it is impossible to conceive of a collective of advisers. And without such a collective in journalism and, I assume, in any area of human activity, nothing that is any good can be accomplished.

Of course, there are circumstances wherein not to make an individual decision means to shirk one's personal responsibility. I hope that no one with whom I have had the good fortune to work in journalism will reproach me for this.

Interior Ministry on Drive Against Drugs

LD3105102190 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] In the last few months more than 150 criminal groups have been exposed in the Soviet Union. They were involved in the drugs business. This was reported by the Ministry of Internal Affairs. An important role in the struggle against them was played by special crime investigation services set up in the republics of Central Asia and the Transcaucasus, where wild opium hemp is picked. The struggle is also intensifying against drug smuggling which has spread on the border with Afghanistan, in the Far East. The Soviet Union has concluded agreements on joint action against drug addiction with the United States of America and Great Britain, France, Canada and Italy.

Plans for New Satellite Communications System

PM0406095690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 31 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: S. Slipchenko A. Arbuzov, identified by caption, reportage on "Marafon" satellite commmunication system]

[Text] [Newscaster] A meeting of co-founders and users of "Marafon," a new commercial satellite communications system, has been held at the Ministry of Communications in Moscow.

[Correspondent] If there were no space communication channels, you would not have been able to watch most of the reports on today's events in the "Vremya" newscast. [video shows chart of space communication ground stations] However, our country is more and more frequently being described as a land of contrasts. The experience of 30 years of manned space flights shows that communication systems in our country have attained a relatively high level. We have both the technical facilities and the potential. We are at all times able to watch television pictures of our cosmonauts working aboard the "Mir" space station—and they are excellent pictures. On the other hand, there are hundreds, even thousands, of cities and population centers which simply have no telephone facilities. Nor is it possible to buy a telephone in a store in our country. How do these two incompatible situations go together?

[E.K. Pervishin, minister of communications, identified by caption] We have now drawn up a program for the coming five-year plan which makes provision for more than doubling the output of all these means. However, the main task when switching to planned market relations lies in ensuring that the facilities, which people require and for which demand has not been satisfied, are given priority development. In order to achieve this it is necessary to ensure that whatever the Ministry of Communication earns remains within the Ministry of Communications so that it can be invested both in communications systems and in the production capacities necessary to manufacture them.

[Correspondent] Each country has its own methods for overcoming crises. It has been claimed that our national income could be quadrupled if the flow of information could be doubled. And that means communication systems. Therefore there are only keen, businesslike people in the hall. No one has nodded off. [video shows conference hall with a speaker answering questions from the floor, charts on the wall illustrating the communication system] People are beginning to understand that it is impossible to obtain anything, including profit, without investing, first. However, it is people's own money that is being invested and spent. That's why the questions from the floor came pouring in.

The "Marafon" system offers practically all types of communications [video shows wall charts listing services provided and comparing the capacity, etc., of the various

systems]. It will come into operation in 1992-1993 and achieve its full capacity in 1995-1996. The five co-founders are inviting cooperation and collecting funds, and reckon that the expenditure will be recouped within three-four years. However, several more commercial satellite communication systems are currently being developed in the country. This marks the end of monopoly positions and the beginning of competition. Everyone present here today is aware of this. And in market conditions only the strongest and most enterprising will prevail.

Economic

Fire Breaks Out at Vorkuta Mine 27 May

LD3105101590 Moscow World Service in English 0930 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] A fire at one of the largest Vorkuta pits in the north of Russia is continuing. The fire broke out last Sunday after methane exploded. Two miners died. Ten were injured and burned. Some are in serious condition. Work is being carried out at the mine to localize the fire and put it out.

Extraction Resumes

LD0206105490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1655 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] Vorkuta (Komi ASSR), 1 Jun (TASS)—Coal extraction has begun at the "Vorkutinskaya" mine where a fire broke out on 27 May during blasting work. As a result, two miners died and ten are in the hospital with various injuries and burns.

As V. Golikov, production director at the "Vorkutaugol" Association reported, the fire is still burning in a worked-out area in the drift 700 meters long, 290 meters wide, and more than 1.5 meters high. However, it has been possible to localize the fire now and to isolate that area by spcial partitions erected in the last few days. The worked-out area will then to be filled with water which will ultimately put out the fire. According to specialists' calculations this will take a month to six weeks.

All the extraction sections of the mine except one, in the drift of which the fire is still burning, have gone back to work. A special commission is investigating what happened. For the moment, the overall damage from this accident has not been determined.

Chemical Plant Converts to Civilian Use

LD0306165290 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Text] A formerly classified chemical mining plant east of Lake Baykal, a plant that mines and dresses uranium ore, is gearing some of its capacity to civilian output. The plant is already producing household chemicals. It expects to obtain raw gold out of gold-bearing concentrates shortly. Conversion in this country has embraced 400 munitions factories.

Natural Gas Deposit Found in Barents Sea

LD3005220990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2100 GMT 30 May 90

[Text] Another natural gas deposit, the (Shtomkanovskoye) deposit, the eighth to be discovered in the area over the past 10 years, has been found on the Barents Sea shelf by the crew of the drilling ship Valentin Shashin. But when will the gas start to come ashore? An agreement was signed in April with firms from Norway, the United States, and Finland on the joint designing of suitable technology and the carrying out of feasibility studies.

Abalkin Notes 'Realism' of Reform Program

904A0384B Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 26 May 90 pp 1, 2

[Interview with Academician L. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by Aleksandr Nadzharov; place and date not specified: "We Cannot Go On Living Like This"]

[Text] **Comments are made on the program for sharply deepening the economic reform by one of its authors, Academician L. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.**

[Abalkin] We are faced with the need to make the most important fundamental decisions and we must understand all of the historical responsibility for this step. The country's economy is in a difficult, critical condition and it has no chance of survival if events continue to develop as they have been. We must decide on radical changes—the most radical in all the history of the Soviet state.

The government program appropriated everything that had been accumulated by the leading scientific schools, the country's social movement, and world practice. This is an open program which includes progressive ideas, regardless of whose they are. From our vantage point it is distinguished by its boldness, its feasibility, and the possibility of verifying its proposals.

[Nadzharov] Does this mean, Leonid Ivanovich, that the achievement of social and personal well-being in our country will be quick and painless?

[Abalkin] That probably happens only in fairy tales. The government program honestly tells us that it is impossible to bring the country out of the crisis easily, without loss and sacrifice—the time for that has passed. We have ahead of us difficult trials and a probable decline of production. But in approximately one and one-half to two years there will be a period first of stabilization and then of flourishing of the economy and a marked improvement of the well-being of the people.

[Nadzharov] With the empty shelves in the stores today can we speak about a flourishing of the economy? Is that not too bold a prediction?

[Abalkin] The optimistic results of the effect of the government program have been precisely verified mathematically and I take full responsibility for my words. With a lesser program one could not count on such depth. This is directed precisely toward a flourishing of the economy, a radical increase in effectiveness, a reorientation in the direction of public demands and social and spiritual values, and flexibility in solving scientific and technical problems. I emphasize that it is not toward patching up holes but toward creating a principally new model of management that the government plan is directed.

[Nadzharov] But what difficulties await us during the course of the reform? What price will the workers have to pay for achieving this long-awaited well-being?

[Abalkin] A significant restructuring will lead to a reduction of production volumes in the next few years. But this will be a healthy process since it will finally become a reality and not just a superficial rearrangement of the economy for appearances; it will mean shutting down a number of overgrown branches of heavy industry and the excessively inflated investment complex and opening up new possibilities for explosive development in the sphere of production of goods and services.

[Nadzharov] But to shift efforts away from heavy industry in the direction of the people-oriented branches of the economy, if one may put it that way, still does not mean a general recession.

[Abalkin] Unfortunately, this is not true. When we total up the planning indicators, especially at the beginning of this process, we see that it produces a general reduction of production volumes. We must pass through this. But we shall be rid of hopeless enterprises that operate at a loss and are receiving colossal subsidies today—and this must be understood—from our wages and pensions.

[Nadzharov] But a general, even if temporary, slump in industry cannot but have an effect on the situation of each of us, of any labor collective, and of any family.

[Abalkin] Alas, that is true. We can expect higher prices and the development of inflation processes which we shall be able to compensate for only partially in the initial stages. This is the price we have to pay for stabilization of the market, for finally putting an end to waiting lines, speculation, and the sale of goods from under the counter. The amount of "commissions" that many people have to pay to speculators and wheeler-dealers in the trade mafia, who are making excessive profit from our present situation, is immense. The so-called fixed prices are largely a formality. In reality they are far from fixed. It is important to cope with the process of inflation, not to let it get out of hand, to master it, and to learn to control it.

There arises the task, on the one hand, of reducing the negative aspects of the proposed reform to a minimum and, on the other, spreading the losses out in a balanced way. We will have people who will not lose even a half percent of their incomes. These are disabled persons, pensioners, large families, and youth going to school. These are people with fixed incomes—educators, medical personnel, military personnel, and workers in the public health system. There are also those who will be able to make up for their possible losses relatively easily, for instance by changing their specialty, increasing their qualifications or the intensiveness of their labor, and so forth. The labor collectives, once they have received independence and the corresponding rights, will be in a position to protect themselves. And they must understand the strict rules of the market: If you are not living as well, you yourself are to blame.

[Nadzharov] The structural rearrangement of our economy, of course, affects the employment of the population as well. You spoke about a slump in production. Does this not mean large-scale unemployment?

[Abalkin] Here I would like to be especially precise. I am absolutely convinced that, in spite of the possible significant release of labor force, discussions of unemployment are absolutely irresponsible. And here is why. We are not and never will speak about throwing "superfluous" people out in the streets. The government program accommodates not an increase in unemployment but the creation of a new system and a new concept of employment. Through retraining in special centers, through switching people to the sphere of services which is so underdeveloped in our country and which can employ tens of millions of people, and through an alternative kind of employment to that which we have today. I have in mind farming, cooperative and individual trade activity, programs for public work (just remember the condition of our roads!) that are implemented by the local soviets. I emphasize that nobody intends to abolish the constitutional right to work in our country. If they did, this would not be socialism.

And only in the most extreme case (if none of the measures mentioned produce results) should we envision unemployment compensation as insurance. But this is a form rather than a goal of social protection.

[Nadzharov] From your words, Leonid Ivanovich, it follows that a fairly precise prediction has been made and even a calculation of both negative and positive consequences of the proposed reforms for the people....

[Abalkin] Yes, and with two variants. The first is very radical and in the next two or three years will lead to very serious social repercussions and to a significant slump in production. But by 1995 there will be very high results, including growth of labor productivity, reduction of material-intensiveness, increased yield on capital, an almost 1.5-fold increase in national income and, consequently, improvement of the well-being of the people. The second envisions a smoother entry into market

relations. But it will also have less of an effect—a 10 to 15-percent increase in national income. With all the attractiveness of the first variant, we in the government are more inclined toward the second, taking into account the fact that it will not lead to serious social consequences. One might call this the radical-moderate variant.

[Nadzharov] Apparently, one way or another, the most important thing of all is to decide on the reforms. As I understand it there is no alternative. For today everyone recognizes that the longer we hold back the harder things will be and the greater the price we will have to pay. But still the people should have a choice. How will it be provided?

[Abalkin] Yesterday a member of our government, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, gave a report in the USSR Supreme Soviet concerning the country's economic situation and the concept of changing over to a regulated market. The discussion of it has begun. If during the course of this discussion the plan is approved, we will suggest submitting it for a nationwide referendum, the first one in all of our history. All who have the right to vote will determine through a direct secret vote which variant of the transformations is more suitable for the country, including the question of the price reform and the methods of social compensation for possible losses.

[Nadzharov] Unfortunately, confidence in the government today has weakened somewhat because of the inconsistency of its decisions. After all, this is the third economic program we have seen in a year....

[Abalkin] But that is not altogether true since each of them follows from the preceding one and makes it deeper and more radical. While previously the discussion was about the concept of economic reform, now it is about practical things—time periods, the legislative base, and so forth. For example, the development of events has forced us to move up a number of previously earmarked measures from 1993 to this year and 1991.

But in general the reproach is justified. We should have prepared for the changeover to market relations earlier and more consistently. This includes trade at commercial prices, auctions, and many other things. Here we have shown a certain indecisiveness. We shall try to make up for it.

[Nadzharov] If the government program is adopted, what will it do this year?

[Abalkin] Before 1 January 1991 we shall have to complete all of the preparatory stage. The necessary legislative acts must be adopted, measures must be introduced for social protection of the population from the negative consequences of the changeover to the new management methods, and the personnel must be retrained. A significant change in the forms of ownership is also envisioned—the creation of joint stock enterprises, the sale of shares in them, the splitting up of large enterprises, leasing, and many other things.

[Nadzharov] And next year?

[Abalkin] A complex of one-time measures related to the changeover to a market economy will go into effect. New prices, taxes, and interest rates will begin to be applied.

[Nadzharov] So can we expect the introduction of free prices?

[Abalkin] Not immediately. We shall adhere to the prices established as of 1 January for three to six months. Then, depending on how things go, we shall gradually cross over to regulated free prices. Actually, even this year the government has removed the controls from potatoes, vegetables, and fruits.

[Nadzharov] Since a rise in prices is inevitable, tell us, please, how large will it be if the program is adopted.

[Abalkin] The cost of food will approximately double, and that of industrial goods—30 to 50 percent. In particular, fabrics and items made from them will increase by 30 to 50 percent, footwear—35 percent, construction materials—by one-half, and household goods—by almost one-third. According to the plan the cost of consumer and municipal services will increase by 70 percent (except for apartment rents). But railroad and airline tickets will be 50 percent higher.

[Nadzharov] And what will be the compensation mechanism about which you spoke?

[Abalkin] We shall propose several variants for discussion. One of them envisions adding about R40 per month to all wages, pensions, and stipends. Additional payments are also envisioned for each dependent person as are stipends for children to compensate for the higher prices of children's goods. An alternative variant envisions a certain percentage of addition to all kinds of incomes. It is also possible to combine the two variants. For instance, for those whose wages are R270 per month we could add R40, and for those who earn more—15 percent of their earnings. All this still has to be discussed. First in the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Nadzharov] And so the proposal has been made. We shall all have to think about it carefully and make a choice. The constant reminders from government representatives that shock (pain) therapy will not be applied are somewhat disturbing. Nonetheless the idea of the proposed reforms can be seen in this phrase: "First it will be painful and then it will be all right." And this is not therapy but surgery. Indeed. The calculated effect from the higher prices of consumer goods should be 198.8 billion, of which 185 billion will go into the incomes of the population to compensate for losses. We get the difference. We must know this. And still it is worth putting up with what we hope are temporary losses. For the government we believe in guarantees us a significant improvement in the people's well-being within a couple of years.

[Abalkin] Of course, without real and not just apparent nationwide approval, the new system of retail prices and

compensations will not be introduced by a referendum. It is possible only with consolidation of all social forces and with universal understanding of the fact that we have no other way out of the crisis. Actually, this is the opinion of all domestic specialists and foreign experts whom the government has enlisted to analyze the proposed plans.

Orlov Interviewed on Aims of USSR Reforms

AU0106152490 Rome ANSA in English 1251 GMT 1 June 90

[Text] (ANSA) Rome, June 1—The chief aims and difficulties of the reforms underway to lead the Soviet Union towards a market economy were outlined by Andrey Orlov, deputy chairman of the State Commission on Economic Reform, in an interview published here today by "ITALIA OGGI" (Italy today).

Boris Yeltsin, the rival and critic of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, has no concrete program behind him, Orlov said dismissively. He rejected calls like those from Yeltsin for quicker reforms, saying that as soon as the people hear the word reform they only think of price hikes, while the [word indistinct] talk only of joblessness. "Imagine what would happen," he said, "if we adopted more drastic solutions." In confirmation of this, he pointed out that 50 to 70 percent of the people were behind the government up until it launched its economic packet. That consensus has now fallen to from 25 to 30 percent.

Before moving on to outline the essential points of the reform packet, Orlov first described the "catastrophic situation" in the Soviet economy. The imbalance between supply and demand for consumer good amounts to around R200 billion ($360 billion). This is a chronic condition in the Soviet Union, he stressed. People are used to waiting in long lines for goods that often run out before they get their turn. Out of some 1,200 consumer products barely 70 can be found on [word indistinct] shelves, he said.

The government program for restructurization [word as received] of the economy is based on a careful study of the situation and aims at greater economic democratization, which includes price reforms, a new system of social security protection, new pensions, and retraining and restructurization in industry, Orlov explained. This will be followed by structural innovations of the banking, credit and tax systems, he continued.

Plans are to reduce the [word indistinct] of state property by forty percent over a three to five-year period. In order to carry out such a vast operation, a capital market is indispensable and Orlov holds that the path to follow is that of launching serious and in-depth stock exchange activities with the participation of foreign capital.

New Business Weekly To Debut in June

PM0106132590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 May 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Businessmen's Newspaper"]

[Text] BIZNES I BANKI [Business and Banks]—This is the title of a financial and economic news weekly which is to come out from June.

The country's first all-Union bankers' newspaper will be published by an information and commercial consortium established by the "Informbank" Agency and leading Soviet banks—the USSR Bank for Industrial Construction, the USSR Agro-Industrial Bank, the USSR Bank for Housing and Municipal Services and Social Development, and the USSR Workers' Savings and Credit Bank. A monthly supplement to the weekly—ZARUBEZHNOYE DELOVOYE OBOZRENIYE [Foreign Business Review]—is also planned.

For the time being, both the weekly and its supplement will be available through retail outlets. The price of BIZNES I BANKI will be 20 kopeks, with the supplement costing R1.90. The question of subscriptions is being studied: "Soyuzpechat" will identify the demand. The information and commercial consortium's plans also include cooperation with well-known Western publications.

Scientific

'Mir' Orbiter, 'Kristall' Module Flights Continue

LD0106201290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1110 GMT 1 Jun 90

[TASS correspondent's report from flight control center]

[Text] Moscow, 1 Jun (TASS)—Anatoliy Solovyev and Aleksandr Balandin are continuing their work aboard the Mir orbiting complex. The scientific part of the crew's program for this week included geophysical, astrophysical, and technical experiments as well as medical research.

In recent days the cosmonauts have carried out several sequences in which they filmed the earth's surface, using videospectrometric equipment installed on the stabilized platform of the resupply module. An appraisal of atmospheric pollution over major industrial regions of the country was also carried out.

The "Mariya" magnetic spectrometer was used to carry out a series of experiments, one of whose purposes is to determine a possible connection between streams of elementary charged high-energy particles in space and seismic activity on earth.

In accordance with the extensive program of research into the earth's natural resources and environmental studies, the cosmonauts will today carry another series of remote probing of specific areas of dry land and ocean.

This work will be carried out with spectrometric equipment and the KAP-350 fixed topographical camera.

In accordance with the medical supervision plan Anatoliy Solovyev and Aleksandr Balandin will monitor their heart and vascular systems while taking exercise on their exercise bicycle.

Experiments to determine the impact of open space on various materials are continuing. Today, in particular, there are plans to study the characteristics of ferromagnetic materials. Samples of these are contained in equipment which is fitted to the outside of the "Kvant-2" module.

The flight of the specialized "Kristall" module, which was put into earth orbit on 31 May, is continuing. There are plans to make a course correction this afternoon in accordance with the program.

According to telemetric information, the systems on board the orbiting Mir complex and the specialized "Kristall" module are functioning normally.

Cosmonauts Conduct Physical Training Experiments

LD0206225190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2000 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] As has been reported from the Flight Control Center, the cosmonauts Anatoliy Solovyev and Aleksandr Balandin are in good health and feel well. The flight is going according to the scheduled program. On Saturday the crew were busy cleaning out the living areas, and conducted a number of medical studies, along with the Sport experiment, which determined the most efficient physical training regime for the cosmonauts during a lengthy period of weightlessness.

New Communications System Presented in Moscow

LD0106162190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 31 May broadcasts on the "Vremya" newscast a report on a meeting of the co-founders and users of Marafon, a new commercial satellite communications system, which was held at the USSR Communications Ministry in Moscow. S. Slipchenko presents a video report on this gathering showing his interview with E.K. Pervishin, the relevant minister. Slipchenko asks what can be done to reconcile the gulf between the sophisticated communications equipment available to the Mir cosmonauts and the lack of basic telephone facilities for ordinary people in many Soviet towns.

The minister responds by alluding to plans to increase telephone production by "just over two times" in the next five-year plan period and calls for priority development of this sector by allowing the ministry to keep its earnings to invest in its own field of activity.

Over video clips of the presentation, held in a press conference format, Slipchenko notes that people are learning that you have to invest before you can reap the profits, and provides some facts about Marafon: "The Marafon system offers almost all forms of communications. It will start operating as early as 1992-93 and achieve its full capacity in 1995-96. The five co-founders are inviting cooperation, collecting money, and they estimate that the expenditure will be recouped within three to four years." However, several other commercial satellite communications systems are currently being developed, Slipchenko adds, without giving any details. This means that the monopoly is gone, and, under market rules, the strongest and most enterprising will prevail.

Space Technology Utilized in Industry

LD0106205290 Moscow TASS in English 2010 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 1 TASS—The super-heavy carrier rocket Energiya will make it possible to launch in 1993 a powerful communication satellite of a new generation, which will provide for the transmission of an enormous amount of various information, Glavkosmos [Main Space Administration] chief Aleksandr Dunayev has stated. He spoke at a briefing on Friday dealing with the application in the national economy of the technologies used during the creation of the Energiya-Buran system, as well as other systems and complexes. Dunayev believes that the energiya carrier rocket will play an important role in the implementation of a Mars exploration programme and in the creation of space factories.

The general-purpose rocket-transport system Energiya-Buran was launched in 1988 at the Baykonur cosmodrome, which will be 35 on Saturday.

Stanislav Polovnikov, head of the Kompozit Association also working in the sphere of space exploration, said that it would produce 100 million needles for disposable syringes before the end of the year. Next year it plans to produce 800 million syringes.

Vyacheslav Bulavkin, representative of the machine-building technology association, spoke at the briefing about the method of applying ceramic coating on metals by means of plasma spraying, which was used only in space construction. Now this technology association, spoke at the briefing about the method of applying ceramic coating on metals by means of plasma spraying, which was used only in space construction. Now this technology is being used to manufacture shafts for paper-making machines and other equipment used on the earth. Specialists who developed the Energiya-Buran system handed over to a number of industrial enterprises the technology of drilling with the help of vertical vibration with a special selected frequency, which permits to make holes up to 400 millimeters deep.

First Ever AIDS Conference Held in Leningrad

LD0106132790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 31 Jun 90

[Summary] "An all-union scientific and practical conference on the state and prospects of the improvement of the prevention and combatting of AIDS in the USSR has ended in Leningrad. Our correspondent Matvey Frolov asked the head of the Department of Highly Dangerous Infections of the city public health and epidemological station, Galina Vladimirovna Volkova, about its results."

[Begin Volkova recording] This was the first such conference in the USSR. The health ministries of all the union republics were represented, plus regional AIDS centers. Work over the past three years was reviewed with "depressing results". Infection in hospitals is higher in the USSR than anywhere else in the world, and half the victims are children. Poor equipment or poor training of middle and junior staff are to blame. Sterilization equipment is scarce. Information on prevention is not being read because it is boringly presented. It's everyone's problem. The conference adopted an appeal to the government and one to the people called for a national program to combat AIDS before it is too late. [end recording]

Military

Yazov Delivers Speech at Far East Conference

PM0406101990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Jun 90 First Edition p 2

[Correspondent Colonel V. Semenov report: "Taking Life's Realities Into Account. From the Far East Military District Party Conference"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] Quest for candid and honest answers to many questions concerning the life and activity of troops in the district, formulation of a specific action program for communists in the light of the conceptual propositions contained in the draft CPSU Central Committee platform, the party statute, and the CPSU Central Committee open letter—this is how one could define the main thesis of the party conference [held in Khabarovsk 30 May]. It was graphically reflected in the report by Lieutenant General A. Voronin, member of the Military Council and chief of the district Political Directorate, the party commission's report covering the period under review, and the speeches by District Commander Colonel General V. Novozhilov; Colonels R. Aushev and V. Lukichev; Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Levchenko; Senior Ensign V. Bogdanov, and others.

Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, delivered a major speech before the party conference participants.

Preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress, he noted, have now entered the final stage. The forthcoming congress is meant to examine the processes now under way in the country and in the party, and to map out ways for the CPSU's further renewal. Millions of communists are awaiting the congress and preparing for it. They pin their hopes on it and associate our socialist state's future with it.

It is well known that the revolutionary perestroyka in the country was actually launched at the party's initiative and under its leadership. Radical transformations of the political system were implemented over the last five years. The country has firmly embarked on the path of democratization of society, expansion of glasnost, and affirmation of real power by the people. The party, having admitted its mistakes, elaborated a strategy of renewal and creation of a socialist rule-of-law state and mapped out the ways for advance toward humane and democratic socialism.

We are on the threshold of implementing radical measures in the economic sphere. This is a question of transition to regulated market relations. The problem of reforming our federation and giving it a new content is being solved. Active perestroyka is under way within the party itself.

Party organizations are at present engaged in a broad discussion of the CPSU Central Committee open letter and the party's draft platform and new statute. It is important to ensure that these precongress documents provide a foundation for rallying our ranks and boosting the role and prestige of party organizations within labor and soldiers' collectives. This is especially necessary in view of the fact that perestroyka processes in society, the party, and the Armed Forces are complex, contradictory, and at times painful. Destructive forces, whose activity is aimed at liquidating the socialist system, breaking down our federative state, and splitting the party, are striving to exploit perestroyka's difficulties. Using the weapons of political demagoguery, intimidation, and slander, they create an atmosphere of social tension, arbitrariness, and anarchy, disrupt the activity of organs of power and management, infringe Soviet people's legitimate rights and interests, and exacerbate interethnic relations. Their efforts are part of a targeted and coordinated campaign to discredit the Armed Forces and the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and KGB organs and troops, in other words the institutions of executive power which are among the most important and necessary guarantors of stability in the people's life and the state's security.

A complex situation prevails in the Baltic republics. The perestroyka processes stimulated a growth of the national awareness of these republics' peoples. Nationalistically inclined separatist forces, which have taken the path of anticonstitutional actions, are trying to take advantage of this.

The situation in the Transcaucasus remains complex. Social processes are extremely politicized in Moldavia and in some regions of the Ukraine and Central Asia. There are also numerous problems here, in the Far East.

All this is often reflected in military collectives, soldiers' barracks, and seamen's quarters. It is reflected in incidents of national egoism and arrogance by individual servicemen, formation of groups along national lines, and the phenomenon of servicemen deserting on national grounds and draftees refusing to serve, a phenomenon which is disgraceful, without precedent in our Army, and alien to its very nature and purpose. There were 6,647 persons who refused to serve in 1989.

Life demands of command and political cadres and of political organs and party organizations new approaches in their work with personnel and draftees, as well as closer contacts with local party and soviet organs.

The practical results of combat training and service graphically indicate, the defense minister went on to say, that communists and the entire personnel in the Far East Military District are properly aware of their tasks and perform their military duty with lofty responsibility. The winter training period was completed with positive results on the whole, the operational and combat training plans were basically fulfilled. A significant role in this was played by the competence, activeness, and persistence of communists in leadership positions and their skill in rallying and leading their subordinates. They include Yu. Melnikov, V. Didenko, A. Avdeyev, V. Yurdanov, A. Krasovskiy, A. Mironov, B. Murin, P. Smagliy, V. Alarin, N. Zinkik, and many others.

But the solution of a whole series of tasks concerning the training of troops is still inadequate. There is much formalism and stereotype attitudes in the operational training of generals and officers and the combat operations by command organs. The professional training level of a sizeable proportion of commanders and political workers remains low. This cannot be tolerated.

The USSR defense minister's speech, the report, and the speeches by conference participants focused attention mainly on the problems of strengthening military discipline. There are some party organizations in the district which have managed to more thoughtfully and specifically organize the personnel's political and military training and have achieved a certain reduction of offenses. But communists cannot rest satisfied with the overall state of discipline.

Many party committees in units and in primary and shop party organizations display passiveness in these matters, often limit themselves to declarations and slogans, do not aim for perestroyka of communists' awareness and mentality, and do not seek new approaches toward work with people. It is important to bear in mind that recruits to the soldiers' ranks also include people whose mentality bears the stamp of the political processes taking place in society.

Unfortunately, all this is still frequently lacking. [sentence as published] The work of many political organs and party organizations is, as before, detached from the realities of contemporary social life and from people's specific interests, needs, and requirements. This can be clearly seen from data cited at the conference. For example, last year the Ministry of Defense received thousands of letters from servicemen and members of their families from the district. There have been a further 1,526 letters in the first four months of this year. Complaints are mainly to do with service conditions, servicemen's social security, and inadequate attention to their needs and requirements. Moreover, inspections have shown that the overwhelming majority of questions raised in the letters could and should have been solved at district level. The following question was raised as a matter of principle: The very fact that assistance is sought from central organs and other institutions must be tackled as a matter of professional honor by communists in leadership positions at local level and must be perceived as proof of their detachment from subordinates.

The conference comprehensively examined other problems of crucial importance for the troops' life and activity. The changes in the world's military-political situation and the perestroyka processes within the country demand corresponding transformations in military building. [passage omitted]

It is evident that the implementation of military reform measures cannot occur overnight, it demands both competence and time. State and party organs on the whole support the views of reform and display interest in and concern for its implementation. All communists are aware of the role of our Armed Forces and the appraisal of them made by the country's president, especially during his Urals visit and in the report on the occasion of the 45th anniversary of victory over fascism. [passage omitted]

Today, it was said at the conference, it would be appropriate to emphasize the fact that it is necessary to build up efforts to enhance the party's role and prestige and the international and military-patriotic education of Soviet people and of Army and Navy servicemen. [passage omitted]

The conference elected delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress.

Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, is among them.

Yazov Article Reviews Tasks of Military Reform

LD0306103590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0850 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 3 Jun (TASS)—Military reform in the USSR should be planned and implemented so as not to inflict damage on the country's defense capacity and the

combat readiness of its Armed Forces. Marshal Dmitriy Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, writes about this in today's KRASNAYA ZVEZDA.

In the minister's opinion, the reform's main tasks are the complete alignment (taking account of the specific results of the disarmament negotiations process) of the military budget, military production, and defense construction as a whole, as well as the personnel, organizational staff structure, and equipment of the Armed Forces, with defensive military doctrine and the principle of reasonable sufficiency, and also the comprehensive democratization of military life and the radical improvement of the social and everyday life of all categories of servicemen.

In accordance with such tasks, the article points out, the defense budget of the USSR has been cut in the current year by 8.2 percent—from R77.3 billion to 70.9 billion. The volume of military production will decrease by the end of 1990 by 19.5 percent. Two classes of missiles and corresponding formations and units are being eliminated in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty. The withdrawal of troops from Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Mongolia is being implemented according to plan. In the course of the unilateral half-million personnel cut in the Armed Forces, 270,000 men and significant quantities of military hardware have been discarded. A central problem of military reform, notes Dmitry Yazov, is the possible switch to an Army manned on a voluntary basis and directed toward the radical improvement of the professionalism of miliary cadres and all personnel. To this purpose the holding of an experiment in improving the manning of the Armed Forces is planned. It is envisaged that from 1992 members of the military in a compulsory term of service in the Navy will serve two years, and from 1991 a version of "contract service" will be tried out selectively in the Navy and will then be implemented in other arms of the Armed Forces and with other types of troops. "Contract" service will enable the recruit to choose either to serve a compulsory term of service of two years or three years on a contract, but with monthly remuneration of R150 and above, provided he masters a field of military specialization within the first six months. The possibility of cutting the term of active military service to 18 months is also being studied.

The USSR defense minister points out that military reform is to be implemented in the course of 9 to 10 years.

Turkestan Military Conference Notes Shortcomings

LD0106174690 Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 300 GMT 30 May 90

[Text] The 24th party conference of the Red Banner Turkestan Military District has concluded its work. Its participants [word indistinct] discussed the speech of Lieutenant General Zakharov, member of the Military Council, head of the Political Directorate of the district. It was noted that in the course of the recently concluded report-back and election campaign in the subunits of the Red Banner Turkestan military district, more than 5,000 proposals and observations to the draft-platform of the CPSU Central Committee and the party rules were submitted and some criticism was addressed to the Political Directorate and government bodies. The [word indistinct] the communists is necessary for the conference itself; they are worried by the state of military discipline, the unstable condition of young officers, many of whom [words indistinct] reports on dismissals from the Army, lack of social protection in the officer corps.

Speaking at the conference, Major General Khudzhanko, commander of the Red Banner Turkestan District Forces, [word indistinct] emphasized that the authority of the party depends on the authority of each communist. In order to make the communists an example, the political departments, units, and subunits are doing quite a lot in all spheres, but under current conditions such efforts are no longer sufficient. They must be doubled or trebled. (?They) will have to be (?defined) according to the draft platform of the 28th CPSU Congress and rules, in which it is emphasized that communists of the Red Banner Turkestan Military District fully support the main provisions of these very important documents, but consider that they are in need of careful revision.

At the conference, delegates to 28th CPSU congress were elected, and orders were given to make all efforts to preserve unity within the ranks of the party, to prevent division and confrontation. Colonel-General Moiseyev, member of the Military Council, head of the Political Directorate of the USSR Ground Forces spoke at the conference, with detailed analysis of the methods and means for political work under the current conditions. The delegates evaluated as satisfactory the work of the political department of the district, and a new party commission was elected. The conference then concluded its work.

Role of Military Trade Services Assessed

90UM0608A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 May 90 First Edition p 2

[Report on interview with Lieutenant General N. Sadovnikov, chief of the Main Trade Administration of the USSR Ministry of Defense, by Major I. Ivanyuk; place, date not given: "Military Trade Without Conjecture and Embellishment"]

[Text] [Ivanyuk] Certain KRASNAYA ZVEZDA readers who are usually patriotic people are asking this question: Why is military trade necessary at all? This is not a time of war and the military selection takes up a good deal of space on the store shelves. There are goods that can also be found in other stores. Or, as is made even clearer by people with quick tempers, there are items which are not to be found in "ordinary" trade. And therefore military trade does not so much engage in trade as it plays the role of "distributors" of goods that are in short supply.

[Sadovnikov] I do not know what lies behind such considerations: elementary misinformation or the ordinary desire to look into someone else's pocket. For some reason nobody has any doubt about the need for the existence of military scholars, medical experts, legal experts, or transportation workers. And it never occurs to anyone to demand that they be converted. Nonetheless there are people who think that the "foreign trade system has not been affected by conversion." I will not try to guess what this might mean with respect to our enterprises that produce pastries, cold drinks.

As concerns statements about the military having some supposed abundance of goods, all kinds of goods that are in short supply, I would call this obsession a malicious conjecture. Apparently there is no shortage of people who desire to look for guilty parties on the outside: They are the cause of all our problems, the shortages are because of them.

[Ivanyuk] Perhaps all this is happening because of a shortage of information. After all, many people judge military trade from its stores which they see next to ordinary city trading points.

[Sadovnikov] Well, that depends on the city. For example, Severomorsk, the city of Leninsk at the Baykonur airfield, and a few others engage exclusively in military trade. Suffice it to say that more than three-fourths of the goods are sold in closed and separate military compounds. If somebody else took charge of the trade and domestic support for remote garrisons located in the Far North, the Far East, the Transbaykal areas, and the high mountain regions, this would ease the burden of the Ministry of Defense a great deal. But our Army has never been inclined toward dependency, and workers in the military trade try to perform their duties with honor.

Frequently they have to work under extreme conditions which arise in more than just daily Army life. Everyone remembers the terrible earthquake in Armenia. There literally in a couple of days we organized the work of 80 stores and kiosks, 20 dining rooms and tea rooms, more than 15 mobile stores, and several consumer service enterprises. The people acted self-sacrificingly and did not spare themselves in their work. For example, the entire family of the chief of the Leninakan military trade facility, A. Aroyan, died under the ruins of his home, but he did not abandon his work place because he was aware that other people needed his help.

During the first days after the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant, military trade organs began to provide service for participants in the cleanup work. They created a trade division, a network of 16 stationary stores, and 15 public catering enterprises, three of which were directly in the accident zone. Each day 70-80 mobile stores went there.

I could also give other figures that describe the volume of work, but this is still not the main thing. The main thing is that the majority of our people—sales personnel, merchants, and other specialists—work conscientiously and diligently, sparing no efforts. Few people know that 21 trade workers, including three officers, died in Afghanistan while performing official duties, and 27 people were wounded. Many were awarded orders and medals of the USSR and the Republic of Afghanistan.

I would like to add to what has already been said that it also takes a good deal of effort to provide service for military training that is regularly conducted at various levels. Such are the ordinary work days of military trade.

[Ivanyuk] Does trade have its own specifications and its own organization? Tell us about it.

[Sadovnikov] Yes, of course, we have our specific features. They are certainly not that in a military trade store you can find rifle slings and collar tabs that cannot be bought anywhere else. Our main peculiarity lies in the fact that military trade is a multibranch business and includes retail trade in food and industrial goods, public catering, consumer services, agricultural production, the output of goods in the military selection, and the tailoring of clothing. It also includes construction and automotive transport enterprises.

Last year our enterprises manufactured about 2.5 million items of military clothing and produced 83 million bottles of nonalcoholic beverages, 107,000 pairs of leather footwear, more than 1 million units of knitwear items, and almost R10 million worth of military haberdashery. Subsidiary enterprises of military trade produced 5,000 tons of milk and 5.8 million eggs, which made it possible to improve somewhat the supply of animal husbandry products for military units.

Trade administrations of the districts and fleets have to rely on their own forces to an even greater degree in questions of consumer services. For many military compounds are located in rural areas and are distant from population points.

For example, rental points have become accepted among families of military servicemen. During frequent relocations, which are inevitable in military service, it is inconvenient to move furniture, television sets, and other household goods—it is simpler just to rent them. Last year we opened up 82 of these points and during the past five years their number has increased six-fold. We shall continue in the future to expand the volume of services rendered.

[Ivanyuk] But still under urban conditions the work of military trade amounts mainly to organizing mobile trade food orders, does it not? And some people perceive this as a means of supplying selected consumers in a time of shortage.

[Sadovnikov] I shall begin with the fact that in and of themselves these forms of trade service, in my view, are very convenient to the consumers. Who is willing to stand in slow-moving lines and spend time running around looking for goods? Incidentally, last year when

the USSR People's Control Committee inspected the work of the military trade enterprises, it noted as a "minus" the inadequate volume of mobile trade and service through orders.

I will admit that this gives some people the impression that this form was contrived for selected people, for generals, as certain publications have it. But this is not true. Priority here is given not to "rank" but to troop units, enterprises, and institutions that do not have their own trade network. I wish to say that mobile trade does not generate a shortage as some people think. It began to be introduced into military trade 20 years ago. During this time the number of trips has increased 10-fold and the volume of goods sold runs into the millions of rubles. From year to year we expand the progressive forms of service but so far, alas, we are proceeding more slowly than we would like to—in addition to everything else, this takes considerable expenditures.

[Ivanyuk] And "everything else" probably means the availability of goods. In the editorial mail there are complaints about these same orders. Thus a group of officers from the main staff of the Navy wrote to the editors that the holiday orders of the central military trade store contain nothing "festive"—it is the usual selection of goods. And we see this in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: The selection is much poorer than what the journalists of civilian publications receive.

[Sadovnikov] I must admit that the criticism is fair, but you can see the difficult food situation in the country. And I have already expressed my attitude toward the legends about the special supply for military servicemen, whether it be a remote garrison or, as some wags say, the "Arbat military district." I understand that special attention is given to the Central Military Department Store; it is, as they say, in the public eye.

This is the oldest and largest enterprise in military trade. The department store is located in a building which before the October Revolution belonged to the economic society of officers of the Russian Army and was used for their trade and service needs. During the first months of Soviet power it was turned over to the Central Worker Cooperative for service for the command and supervisory staff of the Republic Revolutionary Military Council and military servicemen of the Moscow garrison and the organization of mobile trade in the Moscow Military District.

In our day the functions of the Central Military Department Store have expanded. Service has been organized for veterans of the Great Patriotic War and the Armed Forces. Goods are sent by mail to all corners of the country.

The department store staff also includes ateliers for sewing military clothing and a salon for exchanging fabrics for completed uniforms.

As for mobile trade, it produces less than one-third of the store's commodity turnover. Moreover, each year approximately 600,000 food orders are filled, a considerable share of which are for holidays. There is nobody to do this except for military trade. Or take the sugar supply. In Moscow there are about 10,000 officers who do not have apartments. They and the members of their family, as a rule, do not have the opportunity to buy anything with coupons. The Central Military Department Store has also taken responsibility for these concerns. Incidentally, we have to solve problems like this in other cities as well.

[Ivanyuk] Of course military trade does much that is useful. But there are also many shortcomings—violations of the rules of trade, short changing, and rudeness. Many of our readers write about this. And the writers of the letters to the editors are bothered most of all by the violation of social justice in the distribution of goods.

[Sadovnikov] We probably have no fewer of the shortcomings you mentioned than they have in civilian trade. Some people think this is because of a lack of supervision. Not counting the internal inspections, the work of military trade enterprises is supervised by the State Trade Inspections of the USSR and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] as well as the military procuracy, the OBKhSS [Department for Combating the Embezzlement of Socialist Property], and social organizations. For example, an inspection was recently conducted in the Moscow garrison by the metrological service of the Ministry of Defense.

So there is plenty of formal supervision but, alas, it is not a panacea for all problems. In my view, the effectiveness of supervision depends much more on the active position of the community in the garrisons and military and labor collectives. Recently an order came down from the USSR Ministry of Defense making it incumbent on all officials to render all kinds of aid to social controllers. They can now include members of families of military servicemen and workers and employees in the Soviet Army and Navy. These commissions will be chosen by an open vote at general meetings and conferences in the military and labor collectives. It would seem that this will produce results even in the near future. The people themselves must be active here for military trade is serving them.

Letter to OGONEK Editor Korotich Published

90UM0615A Moscow VETERAN in Russian No 22, 28 May-3 Jun 90 p 2

["Open letter" from T. Sadkovskaya to her former university lecturer V.A. Korotich: "'I Am Not the Wind, I Am in This Wind...'"]

[Text] Of course, a serious pretext is required for addressing a prominent individual in keeping with the laws of the genre. I have such a pretext. Recently the Committee for the Issues of Glasnost, Rights, and Appeals of Citizens tried to carry out an assignment of the Supreme Soviet and considered at its meeting

appeals by two groups of deputies regarding articles in the magazine OGONEK, mainly articles which aim to "discredit the USSR Armed Forces," as a letter by 20 deputies says. If you recall, it was published in OGONEK with a commentary which suggested that employees of the editorial office virtually tried to make out the names of signatories with a magnifying glass because they believe that "the people should know their heroes."

More than enough can be written about the meeting, which lasted almost three hours. However, I am not going to do this. First of all the editor of OGONEK promised that his publication would carry a detailed report. Secondly, may the deputies forgive me, but the content of speeches was absolutely predictable. Everything that, putting it mildly, nonsupporters of OGONEK usually say was aired at this meeting as well. Everything that, as a rule, is enthusiastically considered the virtues of OGONEK was unquestioningly stated by "former honor roll combat and political trainee" and currently USSR People's Deputy M. Poltoranin.

You would ask what the result was. Actually, deputy chairman of the committee B. Nikolskiy predicted it in his introductory remarks when he said that they, the legislators, cannot be a punitive or endorsing organ. However, as I see it, in this case the committee merely appeared in the role of a recipient of information, because the results of the hearing were as follows: Approval of the positive aspects of work of the OGONEK editorial board, a suggestion to the editorial office to acknowledge the remarks made, and the decision of the committee to state its position at a session of the Supreme Soviet, insisting in the process... that there is no need to discuss the issue further.

I do not know whether the veterans and servicemen who spoke at the meeting were prepared for this resolution of the committee. However, it appeared to me that you foresaw this very outcome of the affair.

There is a reason to state this. Your response, Vitaliy Alekseyevich, sounded too confident, thought-through, and inspired.

I did not take interest in the response of the deputies whose letter you defined in your favorite manner as a "political denunciation." It is favorite because in your recent interview with Radio Liberty you repeated it a good many times, stating that V. Belov, V. Rasputin, and Yu. Bondarev are writing denunciations of you, as well as other writers who, pardon me, are no less prominent than you.

Never mind the definitions, though pinning labels on one's opponent has always "placed a person outside the community of the intelligentsia," as you yourself observed justly, to be sure, on another occasion and concerning the actions of other persons.

Perhaps affiliation with the intelligentsia should not be the object either when we otherwise hear the speech of a fervent citizen, a patriot, a principled people's deputy. In your professional, journalistic phrases you also communicated to us that you are a communist, told us about your love for the Army and respect for the veterans, and about the need to reinforce glasnost and control with regard to the Armed Forces.... All of this was inspiring, and everybody listened to you, comrades-in-arms and opponents alike. As for me, only one aspect distracted me—the phrases from the above interview which I remembered and which sounded simultaneously in my mind.

Here: "The country is overcoming indifference." There, many people are beginning to listen to appeals for the return of an iron fist.

Here: "I will be defenseless without an Army." There, confidence was expressed in the possibility of a right-wing coup in the country, and then some guys would get on to the OGONEK editor right away.

Here, reflections on glasnost spreading to various spheres of our society. There, lamentations about TASS head Kravchenko being able to distort to his liking the thrust of information even for the president....

Here and there.... My head is spinning; sometimes it is not good to cling to the student custom of listening to "the voices." A discrepancy in information is found, as in the old times of stagnation. Wait a moment! Actually you did not voice anything similar to the following thought to a correspondent of Radio Liberty.

You explained to the people's deputies: "I am not the wind, I am simply trying to understand its direction being in this wind...."

For me these words became a stimulus, a professional prompt of an instructor to a not-so-diligent student of his. I and my fellow students of the time have an iron-clad rule: Either we say good things about our instructors or nothing at all.

Recently we betrayed this tradition of ours. We recalled you, who at one time taught us a short course on the theory and practice of the bourgeois press. At the time you had just returned from overseas, and had managed to write a book condemning their way of life. At the insistence of the dean, we read it without responding to this in any way: We were used to sometimes leafing through such pieces of journalism used as instruction aids. Collections of your poetry could be found in bookstores, but we did not buy them: The students of Kiev had other idols in poetry.

Meanwhile, almost a full auditorium came to look at the editor of VSESVIT live. It was interesting to listen to the man who—we had no doubt about it—was putting together a much better magazine than the union INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA. You talked then, as well as now, with the aristocratic spontaneity of a person who always knows his worth. The motif of talks about their theory and practice was the same: great professionalism

and unscrupulousness with regard to means. Do you remember telling us an entertaining story about production calisthenics for our workers and a cup of coffee for foreign workers? Vexed by the overly free interpretation of your words on one of the first pages of a newspaper, you demanded that the editor publish the text of your refutation. It was published—on the very last page, in the smallest type, and on top of this with a requisite commentary. (This is a trick your readers are familiar with. On the first page, there is the infamous cover "Stalin is With Them." Several issues later, an inconspicuous refutation followed—with a very loud editorial commentary.)

This time around we, your former students, admired the professionalism of our colleagues from OGONEK while at the same time being bewildered by their unscrupulousness as to methods and the tendentiousness of facts, which can in no way be attributed solely to their loyalty to perestroyka. Perhaps, you could once again brilliantly deliver a course similar to the old one but with a different name, for example, "Theory and practice of work of the magazine OGONEK." In the process there would be no need to change some of the professorial cliches prepared at the time.

During this conversation-reminiscence a former fellow student of mine, currently the editor of an oblast youth newspaper, uttered a phrase which is very similar to your current unwitting admission. Perhaps I will not take upon myself to comment on it, because I foresee at least two possible interpretations of this beautiful allegory, and I do not know which one you are going to prefer. However, the allegory is equivocal to begin with. There are different winds. There are fresh, joyous winds, harbingers of life-giving water from the heavens which determine prospects for the future crop. There are destructive typhoons which sweep away everything in their path. There are many other, different winds—there is even an entire "Dictionary of Winds." Which wind are you in?

Please do not consider this an idle question. Once again it is the pretext that is the point. There were many original thoughts in your interview with Radio Liberty. However, one aspect transcended the framework of common sense, at least my common sense. You announced your agreement with some American public figure regarding the holding of an international conference on hatred and maintained that it would serve to bring the peoples closer together. I believe that the cause-and-effect relationship here is not entirely in order.... Hatred can only live in a heart that has no love. They did not manage to teach me this at the university. This happens to be from the course "Theory and Practice of Life."

[Signed] T. Sadkovskaya

Baltic Republics

Polish Petrol for Lithuania Stopped at Border

AU0406105590 Paris AFP in English 1032 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 4 (AFP)—Soviet border guards have blocked 15,000 tonnes of Polish petrol intended for the break-away republic of Lithuania, according to Monday's edition of INTERFAX, a semi-official publication of Moscow Radio.

The government of Lithuania bought the fuel from Poland in convertible currency. It was to have been sold to Lithuanian motorists, starved of fuel for more than a month as a result of economic sanctions imposed by Moscow since April 19 in retaliation for Lithuania's declaration of independence March 11.

INTERFAX said the guards, who belong to the KGB secret police, blocked the shipment at the Soviet border between Poland and Lithuania on Friday night. It was to have been sold in Lithuania at 1.6 rubles (2.50) dollars a liter, four times the usual price.

Radio Vilnius last week said Lithuania had concluded trade agreements with Poland. But the official Soviet news agency TASS, quoting official Polish sources, denied the report in a dispatch datelined Warsaw.

Lithuanian Commission Meets, Views Power Issues

LD0106105790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Correspondent Vitas Usas reports on the 1 June meeting of the government commission on the regulation of the economic situation in Lithuania at the Lithuanian Council of Ministers]

[Text] The meeting started with information on the consumption of electricity. Industrial enterprises were working yesterday, although night shifts had to be organized in many places. One fourth of the consumed electricity was generated in Lithuania, counting the Ignalina nulcear power station. [Word indistinct] received from the North Western System. The state republican power station is operating today at a minimum load, but it still uses 1,260 tonnes of fuel oil per day. Apart from the existing modest stocks, another 12,000 tonnes of fuel oil have been obtained. It is being distributed among the enterprises in the food industry and in the building materials industry.

Disturbing news was announced at the meeting—there is information that the center has instructed the railways not to transport fuel oil to enterprises under the Union administration in Lithuania. The supply of raw materials may stop, too. This would destabilize the situation at those enterprises.

The supply of steam must be limited because of a shortage of fuel oil. The housing construction combine in Alytus may therefore cease production and the republic's builders would be deprived of some products. It was decided to allocate a quantity of fuel oil to the Alytus boiler house so that the main sections at the housing construction combine will be supplied with a sufficient quantity of steam.

Another important question was how to supply transport with fuel. A busy season starts in agriculture, therefore calculations are being made about the quantity of fuel needed for agricultural machinery. It was stated that the required quantity of petrol must be allocated for motor transport carrying loads from railway stations. The center in Moscow could otherwise apply new sanctions.

Here is news from Taurage. The cooperative there proposes to sell fuel oil obtained from a neighboring country at commercial prices. It was decided officially to legalize such trade and pay the received profit into the local government budget.

In conclusion, some information from the Ministry of Trade: yesterday goods worth 2,500,000 rubles were received from the Soviet Union.

More on Energy Situation

LD0206092690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] A communique of the Lithuanian government on the economic situation in the republic: According to information from the Lithuanian Ministry of Power Engineering, on the 44th day of the blockade power requirements in the republic are somewhat lower because some industrial enterprises succeeded in reorganizing their production cycle to work off-peak hours.

The Ignalina nuclear power station and the Lithuanian state regional power station are working today at the same minimum regime, but the enterprises must continue to adapt their production processes to the general power situation.

It is impossible to obtain certain quantities of oil products by direct agreements. They are, first of all, supplied to vitally important economic objects and transport. Although preparations have been carried out to trade in gasoline at commercial prices and useful agreements have been concluded, so far it is difficult to implement these plans because of transport problems. Cooperatives are displaying their intiative in trading oil products.

The government commission for regulation of the economic situation has instructed some government advisers and the Lithuanian Fuel Production Association to examine these proposals from the legal point of view and take care of the organizational problems of such trade.

The ministries of trade and agriculture revealed their plans to trade in meat and milk products in exchange for other products needed by Lithuania. Problems of reorganizing Lithuanian agriculture were discussed. Above

all, as a basis for the exchange of products, equivalent prices of fodder and meat have to be fixed, the fodder balance must be changed gradually, and ways must be found to reduce consumption without reducing the manufacture of animal produce.

Fuel Shortages Cause Closure of Enterprises

LD0106170990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2045 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] The Lithuanian Statistics Department reports that on 30 May there was forced idling in over a third of industrial, transport, and construction enterprises because of a shortage of power, fuel, and material resources; with 21,900 people not working and 15,400 people taking their holidays earlier than planned. Apart from that, 8,900 rural machine operators were not engaged in their main duties.

Eight industrial enterprises are not working at all: Four sugar refineries, the Mazeikiai oil refinery, the factory of electric furnaces in Utena, the artificial fiber works in Kaunas, and the second factory of ferroconcrete constructions in Vilnius.

Landsbergis Criticizes Gorbachev Remarks

LD0106224990 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian parliament, has said that Mikhail Gorbachev's verbal attack against Lithuania yesterday [as heard] in Ottawa was baseless and undiplomatic. President Gorbachev called the declaration of the independence of Lithuania to be the result of night conspiracy and confusion. The Soviet president maintained that the present leadership of Lithuania is a bunch of adventurers who are exploiting the national feelings of the people for their own ambitious (?needs). President Gorbachev said that he was strongly pressured in the Soviet Union on the issue of Lithuania. However, he did not specify (?all) these pressuring forces. He promised to resolve the Lithuanian issue according to the style and atmosphere of perestroyka. Mikhail Gorbachev did not deny the possibility of using extreme measures, but he also added that he would like to avoid resorting to them.

Vytautas Landsbergis said that the problem of Lithuania did not make the life of Mr. Gorbachev any easier, but that some nervousness can be fully understood. Most probably, noted Mr. Landsbergis, emotions are taking the upper hand. He also said that Mikhail Gorbachev seems to be strongly deluded and he should be helped to come to correct conclusions.

Vytautas Landsbergis was speaking today after returning to Vilnius from his private visit to Prague. [passage omitted]

Report on Landsbergis CSFR News Conference

LD0106081190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0300 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] The two-day private visit to Czechoslovakia by Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, has come to an end. He was there at the personal invitation of CSFR President Havel. Before his flight back to Moscow, Landsbergis organized a press conference. His account of the history of the Sajudis movement was interrupted by an exclamation from one of the Western correspondents who said: We know all that from the papers, tell us about the actual results of the visit. The Lithuanian guest declined to give a direct answer to the question, noting that it is not possible to tell the press about every accord reached.

New 'Soviet Lithuania' Radio Station Reported

LD0206040690 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Some Russian things differ from other Russian things. An anonymous TASS correspondent from Vilnius has announced the beginning of broadcasts tomorrow by a new radio station, Sovetskaya Litva, translated as Soviet Lithuania. No information is given on its location, however, it is stated that it will broadcast programs daily, through medium wave-lengths in Lithuanian, Polish and Russian. [passage omitted]

[Word indistinct] Why not imagine that the CPSU section in Lithuania, by using the unlimited financial assistance it has at its disposal, has added to its ideological means' arsenal and undoubtedly violated Lithuania's press law.

In communications experts estimation, the SOVETSKAYA LITVA signal will be broadcast from a transmitter located in Sovetsk, formerly Tilze. Also, military communications signals will be employed in the transmission.

Party Views New Station

LD0206095690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Report by Guoda Salciute]

[Text] Discussions are taking place today at the second stage of the 21st Congress of the Lithuania Communist Party (CPSU). According to TASS, a live relay started today from this congress at 1100. A new radio station, Sovetskaya Litva, started its work with this broadcast. TASS goes on to state that this radio station will broadcast every day and will be heard from beyond the borders of Lithuania.

Since we knew nothing about this radio station, where it has been registered and from where it is operating, we asked chief engineer of the Electrocommunications

Department at the Lithuanian Ministry of Communications, Anicetas Seminigis. He said that there is no such station in Lithuania and that it may be situated beyond the borders of Lithuania.

Thus, Sovetskaya Litva is an underground station. Maybe listeners know something about it. If somebody has heard this live relay, I would like to state that Lithuanian Radio has nothing to do with it.

Lithuanian Councils Discuss Vilnius Problems

LD0106202790 Moscow TASS in English 2002 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Kazys Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius June 1 TASS—Over 200 local council deputies from five Lithuania's southeastern districts gathered today in Salcininkai district, not far from the republic's capital to discuss problems of the Vilnius region where Poles form the majority of the population.

Deputies of Salcininkai and Vilnius districts at their sessions have adopted decisions that "the USSR and Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic's Constitutions are in force on their territories" and that the districts "remain parts of the Soviet Union", in spite of the Lithuanian parliament's decisions.

Several days ago the Lithuanian parliament annulled the district councils' decisions on the issue, but deputies do not agree with this.

The current meeting was discussing mutual programmes of actions. It has dragged out till late in the evening.

A meeting, organised by Sajudis, was held in Vilnius today. It was attended by representatives from Moscow, Leningrad and several Union republics who voiced their support for the republic's government.

Report on Council Farm Loan, Pension Decrees

LD0106173690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1600 GMT 31 May 90

[Telephone report by "government information representative" Ceslovas Jursenas]

[Excerpts] I want to acquaint you with the latest decisions of the Council of Ministers of the republic of Lithuania. Here is a decree passed a few days ago: In connection with the decree of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers of 20 December 1989: to write off R7,989,000 of long-term and R5,684,000 of short-term bank credits to the collective farms, state farms, and other agricultural enterprises, the repayment of which has been postponed by the decisions of the government. [passage omitted]

A decree has been adopted on personal pensions and the abolition of some privileges for personal pensioners. The government has decided: First, until a new law on pensions of the republic of Lithuania is passed, personal pensions in the Lithuanian republic are given in accordance with the established order to persons who have greatly contributed to the preservation, restoration, and consolidation of Lithuania's statehood. Second, to approve a proposal by the Ministry of Social Insurance on setting up a commission on pensions attached to the Ministry of Social Insurance.

I wish to add here that the minister of social insurance, Dobrovolskis, has been appointed chairman of the commission.

The third article in the decree: To abolish from 1 July of this year extraordinary grants and allowances to personal pensioners for the length of party membership, and also corresponding grants and allowances to persons imprisoned or exiled for political activity up to July 1940, and to participants in the civil war.

And the fourth and last article: To instruct the Ministry of Social Insurance to submit by 11 June of this year to the government of the republic of Lithuania a draft project of temporary regulations on pensions.

And here is yet another decree by the Council of Ministers: The former Vilnius branch of the Union Research Institute of Technical Aesthetics has been transformed into the Lithuanian Design Institute.

Lithuanian Resolution Seen as 'Sidestep'

90UN1951A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 25 May 90 p 1

[Article by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA correspondent S. Balyutskiy, Vilnius: "A Step Toward a Compromise"]

[Text] At a meeting of the Supreme Council of Lithuania yesterday, Deputy B. Rupeyka asked republic Prime Minister K. Prunskiene this question: "As an economist, can you calculate how much Lithuania loses every day, failing to prepare a resolution capable of opening the road to negotiations in the days since your meeting with M. Gorbachev and N. Ryzhkov?" (This is to say, also a road to the cancellation of economic sanctions against Lithuania—note by S. Balyutskiy).

Prime Minister K. Prunskiene avoided answering this. Well, let us try to make calculations ourselves. I would recall that at the previous meeting A. Brazauskas, reporting to the deputies on the condition of the economy, announced that daily R2.7 million fail to reach the republic budget. This means that losses over six days amount to R16.2 million. This is how much the resolution finally adopted by the Supreme Council is costing. Taking into account this impressive amount, I am going to quote the resolution in full.

"With a view to resolving a set of issues associated with the consolidation of the restored independent Lithuanian state, the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania resolves:

"1. To suspend for the duration of official state-to-state negotiations all actions and decisions on implementing the 11 March act which affect the interests defined by the two parties to be the subject of negotiations.

"2. The present resolution takes effect at the beginning of state-to-state negotiations between the republic of Lithuania and the USSR and applies for the duration of negotiations which is determined by the parties."

Therefore, as was expected, the Act on the Restoration of the Independent Lithuanian State was left intact. This was particularly emphasized by the chairman of the republic Supreme Council, V. Landsbergis, in his speech.

Moreover, not a single one of the legislative acts adopted as an extension of ideas stated in the Independence Act was canceled. This means that the proposal still is for the USSR leadership to conduct negotiations with Lithuania outside the framework of Union legislation; in the opinion of the republic Supreme Council, neither the law on the secession of a Union republic from the USSR nor the law on universal military service applies on the territory of Lithuania—and this is particularly important at this time, the time of the spring draft.

However, even this statement, indefinite and generally very non-committal for Lithuania, drew harsh criticism from both the supporters of the Freedom League of Lithuania who have picketed the building of the Supreme Council of Lithuania for several days now, and some of the deputies. Their proposal is to have no compromises and no negotiations with Moscow whatsoever.

Speaking during the debate, republic Foreign Minister A. Saudargas said, substantiating his position: "We should not view the adoption of this resolution as a step backward. We are moving ahead."

Undoubtedly, the resolution adopted cannot be regarded as a step backward. However, it can also hardly be called a step forward... It is rather a sidestep away from the ironclad position in which one hears only one argument and which acknowledges that there is only one right way. Be that as it may, it is a step in the direction of negotiations.

Prunskiene on Talk With Gorbachev, Ryzhkov

90UN1951A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 21, 26 May-1 Jun 90 p 5

[Report on interview with Kazimiera Prunskiene, prime minister of the republic of Lithuania, by an unidentified ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent; place and date not specified: "Hope for a Compromise"]

[Text] When Doctor of Sciences Kazimiera Prunskiene agreed to assume the post of deputy chairman for economics of the republic Council of Ministers last year, her name was almost unknown outside Lithuania. Today it is known to the entire world. She, the former rector of an institute and currently prime minister, meets with presidents and ministers.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] Your meeting with the leaders of the USSR has finally taken place. However, it has not been covered in detail in the Soviet press. What, after all, was discussed at the meeting?

[Prunskiene] Indeed, on 17 May I met with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and Prime Minister N.I. Ryzhkov in the Kremlin. We reviewed opportunities for resolving through negotiations the issues which have arisen and variants of getting out of the conflict. Our position is outlined in the declaration of the Supreme Council and the Council of Ministers of Lithuania which I handed to the president. We are prepared to compromise on a number of issues. Thus, the declaration says that the republic of Lithuania is prepared to suspend temporarily the implementation of the Supreme Council resolutions which affect special interests of the Soviet Union and which may become the subject of negotiations during a period of transition to implementing our de facto independence. For the first time, we stated our intent to compromise in the defense sphere, indicating the possibility of Lithuania's participation in the defense system of the Soviet Union. At the meeting, we discussed the issue of assets in dispute and a new quality of economic relations with the preservation of mutually advantageous ties. We stated our intentions regarding the defense of the social rights of USSR citizens residing in Lithuania. We are prepared immediately to begin discussions and compromise on these and other issues. However, the Soviet Union is calling on us to rescind or, at a minimum, to suspend the independence acts themselves as contravening the Soviet Constitution. This indicates the striving to confine our actions to the laws of the Soviet Union and brings about the beginning of negotiations—the status of Lithuania as the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. However, according to our decisions and our laws, the latter does not exist anymore!

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] In this instance, your position also becomes firm. However, to what degree do the Supreme Council and its chairman stand together with you?

[Prunskiene] I have already talked to Vytautas Landsbergis; this issue will also be discussed at a session of the Supreme Council of Lithuania. We need to know the opinion of our deputies, although it seems to me that it is unequivocal. As I see it, it would be very risky for us to undermine the effect of our declaration ourselves, any guarantees of the strong side notwithstanding. We have restored justice, which was trampled on by Stalin and Hitler, in a democratic manner, taking advantage of the right of the people to sovereignty and self-determination. It does not make sense to go back.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] However, a law on procedures for seceding from the USSR has already been adopted.

[Prunskiene] The position to which the Soviet Union adheres is exactly to return us to the status of a Union republic and for us to undertake all our further actions within the framework of this and other USSR laws. In this case, variants which bring pressure to bear on us are possible.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] In your opinion, will the Soviet side continue to insist on rescinding the acts before the negotiations begin, or are compromise variants possible?

[Prunskiene] I believe that this difference does not entail any loss for the Soviet Union. However, a search for joint compromises may satisfy the real interests of the two countries. Being the weak side, we should take our steps in the process taking into account the risk posed by the USSR, which desires to return the situation to the beginning of March.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] Do you believe that the position of the USSR leadership with regard to Lithuania is unified? Will it change after this meeting?

[Prunskiene] As I see it, the position of the president and the prime minister in this regard is unified. As I understood, there is interest in starting the negotiations. Both the general situation in the world and the interests of the USSR itself require this. However, I also understood that there is no interest in recognizing the independence of the republic of Lithuania.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] In general, can your meeting with the USSR president and the prime minister be considered the beginning of negotiations between the Soviet Union and Lithuania? Were subsequent meetings scheduled?

[Prunskiene] This is not the beginning of negotiations yet; this is an exchange of views on opportunities for negotiations, on the steps the Soviet side will take following our declaration on opportunities for a compromise. It is up to the Soviet Union to take the next step. However, it is not only the beginning of the negotiations that is important for us, but also their outcome.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] Were opportunities for discontinuing the blockade of Lithuania discussed?

[Prunskiene] First of all, I was very much surprised by the fact that the prime minister of the USSR does not consider the actions of his country an economic blockade, but classifies them as "certain incomplete deliveries" for which we are to blame ourselves because we are "incapable of communicating with your partners." It would be interesting to know how we became poor partners following the excellent fulfillment of contracts in the first four months of this year.

AFTERWORD. On 23 May the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania made this decision: "To suspend for the duration of official state-to-state negotiations the actions and decisions following from the implementation of the 11 March Supreme Council acts which affect the interests to be defined by the two parties as the subject of negotiations." The next move is up to Moscow...

Prunskiene Sends Letters to U.S. Leaders

LD0106230190 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] During her meeting this evening with Vilnius residents, Kazimiera Prunskiene disclosed that she has sent personal letters to President George Bush, Secretary of State James Baker, and the senators with whom she had met previously. These were handed to them prior to the summit meeting.

The group comprised about 20 persons in all. The contents have not been disclosed. Government leader Kazimiera Prunskiene also announced that she sent an open letter to United States state and public activists today.

It contains an appeal to the President, senators and congressmen, all public activists, politicians, and journalists with whom the Lithuanian premier had an opportunity to associate during her visit in Washington at the beginning of May.

In addition to other points, the letter stresses the fact that Lithuania is no longer a territory ruled by the Soviet Union. Even its actions in Lithuania are restricted mostly to military activities. Doubts that are too long-lasting and a delay in identifying Lithuania's state administration and its government with the independent state of Lithuania, whose past annexation has not been recognized on an international level, constitute an ambiguous adherence to the principle of this nonrecognition, Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene noted.

Commentary on Prospects for Lithuanian Talks

LD0206123690 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Commentary by Vitaliy Gurov]

[Text] The Lithuanian government has taken a decision that, as it believes, should strengthen the republic's independence through talks with the USSR. The decision says that during the talks with the Soviet leadership the decisions and actions of the Lithuanian republic, taken in keeping with and to develop the declaration of independence of 11 March, will be suspended. Lithuanian MP's [Members of Parliament] regard this move as a step towards a compromise with the center, writes our commentator, Vitaliy Gurov.

However, I cannot share their optimism. Other acts of legislation are in the focus of attention of the policy

makers. And the reason is, they contradict the USSR Constitution. The obstacle is the declaration of independence itself. Adopted in haste and, to my mind, without sufficient political and economic guarantees from the angle of Lithuanian interests, it just remains a beautiful and somewhat romantic document.

According to a report by the French news agency the chairman of Lithuania's parliament, Vytautas Landsbergis, said unofficially a few days ago that his republic was ready to consider the issue of suspending or freezing the declaration of independence provided following that the republic did not fall under Soviet jurisdiction. Frankly speaking, this statement gave some hope that a dialogue is possible. It was the allegiance to the declaration that made it impossible for talks to start. However, in an earlier commentary we at Radio Moscow voiced some concern over Mr. Landsbergis' condition about the Soviet jurisdiction.

And now the latest report: Having returned from Prague, Vytautas Landsbergis said in the Moscow airport that possibly his words about suspending or freezing the declaration had been misunderstood and wrongly interpreted. No one has empowered us to change this expression of will of the Lithuanian people, he said. Let's not assess both statements by Mr. Landsbergis since they were made unofficially. And yet as a Lithuanian MP, Justas Paleckis, has said, he believes talks would begin within a month or six weeks. I don't know what is more in these words—a knowledge of the situation in the republic's parliament or hope for the commonsense of the Lithuanian leadership. But clearly talks are overdue. That is shown both by the extremely hard economic situation in Lithuania and by the still worsening political situation in the republic which has already brought about a division on nationality grounds.

The processes in Lithuania are regarded quite differently in a number of other Soviet republics. Say in Latvia and Estonia, they have found understanding at government level. Members of the Moldavian parliament have recognized the independence of Lithuan... Groups of deputies in Leningrad and Moscow are ready for direct talks with the Lithuanian leadership. These actions of people's deputies in various regions, as far as I gather, contain no preliminary conditions for the start of negotiations with Lithuania.

In this connection I would like to make a reminder of the stand of the highest body of power in this country, the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. The stand is this: to solve the problem politically within the procedures provided by the USSR Constitution and Soviet national laws.

Loyalist Lithuanian Party Congress Resumes

LD0206161690 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] The Lithuanian Communist Party remaining loyal to the national Communist Party's platform has begun the second stage of its 21st congress in Vilnius. The delegates will define their attitude to the draft documents adopted in the run-up to the 28th CPSU Congress and discuss the future of the party, republic, and the country. They will also elect delegates to the national Communist Party's congress.

The Lithuanian Communist Party broke up at the end of last year into an independent branch and one retaining ideological and organizational links with the CPSU. The latter has been holding a three-stage congress which began with debates over the political report and elections of the party's leadership. The third and last stage is scheduled for the end of July.

Adopts Resolutions

LD0206204190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1733 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] Vilnius, 2 June (TASS)—The 21st Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) continued its work here today.

The congress sessions resumed with discussion of a report "On the Drafts of the CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th CPSU Congress and of CPSU Rules" which was delivered to congress delegates by Vladislav Shved, second secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee.

The political side of the situation, noted the rapporteur, is characterized by further intensification of the confrontation between the republic's Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Union. The degree of this confrontation is defined not by statements from the republic's Supreme Soviet about tolerance and friendliness towards the USSR, which are not in short supply, but by real actions, the adopting of several acts which violate the USSR Constitution and by the creation of relevant state structures. Anti-Soviet and anti-communist moods are increasing in the repuplic.

In the economic sphere, these are attempts to force the pace of the privatization of the republic's national economy, as are crisis phenomena caused by the amateurish and adventurist policy of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet and government which have adopted a policy of unilaterally severing ties with the Soviet Union.

At the same time, there has recently been increasing opposition to this policy from various sections of the republic's population. Nonetheless, it is doubtful that realism will prevail in the policy of the republic's Supreme Soviet and government. Therefore the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania supports the demands of progressive forces in the republic for the government to resign and the Supreme Soviet to give up its powers.

Regarding Lithuanian independence, which is what concerns the people of the republic more than anything else, the rapporteur and those who spoke in the debate expressed a single opinion: the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) favors a socialist Lithuania which is

completely independent in resolving its own republican problems, and which is a free and voluntary member of the Soviet Federation on the basis of a renewed Union treaty.

The Communist Party of Lithuania rejects the unilateral declaration of Lithuanian independence by the Supreme Soviet on 11 March, and believes that the self-determination of the Lithuanian people should be expressed only on the basis of a direct expression of its will through a referendum which takes the interests of national minorities fully into consideration, implementing the right to self-determination within the framework of the USSR law "On the procedure for Resolving Issues Connected with the Withdrawal of a Union Republic from the USSR."

Congress delegates agreed that the Lithuanian Communist Party, like the CPSU as a whole, is in crisis. As they prepare for the 28th Party Congress and think about what to do next, communists stresed the urgent need to learn lessons for the future.

The 21st Congress of the Communist Party of Lithuania (CPSU) supported the basic provisions of the drafts of the CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th Party Congress and of the CPSU Rules.

The Congress of Lithuanian Communists approved the proposals of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) on the drafts of the 28th CPSU Congress documents under discussion and adopted resolutions entitled "For the 50th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet power in Lithuania" and "On the assessment of the historical path of the Lithuanian Communist Party" and elected delegates for the 28th CPSU Congress.

It is planned to hold the third stage of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) Congress after the 28th CPSU Congress has ended.

Estonian Deputies Seek International Commission

LD0106205690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1820 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Karchenko]

[Text] Tallinn, 1 Jun (TASS)—The members of the deputies' "Equal Rights" group of the Estonian Supreme Soviet have sent an appeal to UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar, as well as to U.S. President George Bush and to the leaders of a number of European countries requesting that "a competent international commission be set up to work out objective assessments of the events of 1920, as well as of 1939-40 in Europe, which have today become the main argument for violating democracy in the Baltics and for opposing the progressive undertakings of Mikhail Gorbachev...."

Commenting on the appeal, Pavel Panfilov, a deputy of the republic's Supreme Soviet and secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Estonia on the CPSU Platform, who signed the document, recalled in a conversation with the TASS correspondent that in 1940, on a decision from the supreme bodies of state power the Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian republics voluntarily entered the USSR. And at that time their governments made no protests either to the international community or to the League of Nations. Today, however, Estonia's leaders are calling this act, carried out half a century ago, an act of "occupation and annexation" of the republic's territory by the USSR. As proof, the argument is cited that the State Duma was not authorized to make such a decision without discovering the opinion of the population by means of a referendum. At the same time, however, the Supreme Soviet by its mechanical majority and in spite of the Constitution of the USSR and of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], is now unilaterally adopting laws which declare the effective secession of Estonia from the Soviet federation, without in its turn having sought the views of the inhabitants of the republic.

This decision by the supreme body of state power has caused a wave of protest among a very large group of the republic's inhabitants. Moreover, these people are not against the national statehood of Estonia. They demand that it be implemented by democratic means, taking into account the voice of each person living there rather than by diktat methods, said Pavel Panfilov.

"We decided to appeal for the establishment of a competent international commission which will provide an answer to all the questions raised. The people must know the truth, not be under the thumb of political intriguers." Pavel Panfilov stressed in conclusion.

TASS Assesses Estonian Parliament's Decisions

LD0106202190 Moscow TASS in English 2000 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallin, June 1 TASS—The Estonian Supreme Soviet has considered at its plenary sittings reports about the May 25 session of the Congress of Estonian Citizens in Tallinn and the May 26 meeting of deputies and representatives of work collectives in the coal-mining city of Kothla-Jarve.

The congress united persons who were citizens of bourgeois Estonia, their direct descendants and those who wish to have the citizenship.

The congress decided to empower its standing body, the Estonian Committee, with legislative functions under the pretext that "supreme legislative power does not exist in Estonia at present".

The republican parliament denounced the attempt to establish a dual power structure. Speakers at its session observed that any statements and actions directed at establishing alternative bodies of authority amount to calls for disobedience to legitimate state bodies. Deputies believe that the attempt to establish an alternative

power structure was also undertaken at the Kothla-Jarve meeting. Its participants, pressing for the preservation of the Soviet Federation, formed an interregional council of deputies and working people of Soviet Estonia.

The session evaluated these actions as destabilising factors.

The decisions only continue the anti-constitutional steps that have marked the republican leadership's social and political activities over recent months.

At the first session on March 30 this year the Estonian Supreme Soviet proclaimed in its resolution "on the state status of Estonia" that Soviet Government is illegitimate on Estonian territory since the moment of its establishment.

By adopting this act, the republican parliament departed from law and the Constitution on the basis of which it was elected, thus outlawing itself.

The first departure from law was followed by other steps: The unilateral annulment of the Soviet law on universal military service, the adoption of a law abolishing state symbols of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic and removing the words "soviet" and "socialist" from the official name of the republic.

Law should be observed as long as it exists. The Estonian Supreme Soviet prefers to act without taking into accout either Union or international standards.

The entire republic is in a state of virtual hysteria because of all these acts. Brief periods of a relative equilibrium give way to bouts of political tension.

The situation is fraught with unpredictable consequences given the overall worsening of economic situation in the republic.

Estonia's supreme body of state authority has found itself in a position of a hostage of its own violations of legality.

End of Estonian Parliament Session Reported

LD0206202590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The latest session of the Estonian Supreme Soviet has ended in Tallinn. Since there was a failure to prepare in time a draft law on ownership for a second reading, this item had to be excluded from the agenda. As a result, the main issues in the program of plenary sittings were reports, added to the agenda, on the session of the Congress of Citizens of Estonia, held on 25 May in Tallin, and also on the meeting of people's deputies and representatives of work collectives held on 26 May in the mining town of Kohtla-Jarve.

The attempt to establish dual power was condemend by parliament. At the sesison of the Supreme Soviet, all these steps were evaluated as destablizing the situation in the republic; however deputies preferred to avoid recognizing the fact that attempts to form alternative bodies of power in Estonia are a direct result of the anti-constitutional actions which have, in recent months, marked the activity of the Supreme Soviet itself and the republic's government.

Estonian Resolution on State Status Published

90UN1466A Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 1 Apr 90 p 1

[Decree of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic: "On the State Status of Estonia"]

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] resolves that the occupation of the Estonian republic by the USSR on 17 June 1940 did not interrupt the existence of the Estonian republic de jure: The territory of the Estonian republic is occupied up to the present time.

The Supreme Soviet of the Estonian SSR, taking into account the clearly expressed will of the Estonian people to restore the independence of the Estonian republic and the legal state power:

declares the state power of the USSR in Estonia to be illegal from the time of its establishment and proclaims the beginning of the restoration of the Estonian republic (restitutio ad integrum)[published in Latin];

declares a transition period which will end with the formation of the constitutional organs of state power of the Estonian republic.

The Supreme Soviet of the Estonian SSR is developing temporary procedures for rule during the transition period, including legal guarantees for all residents, regardless of their nationality.

The present decree goes into effect from the moment of its adoption.

[Signed] A. RYUYTEL, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian SSR.
Tallinn, 30 March 1990.

Riga Authorities Introduce Food Rationing

LD0106193790 Moscow TASS in English 1756 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By LETA-TASS correspondent Tatyana Kovalevskaya]

[Text] Riga June 1—Food rationing was introduced in the Latvian capital of Riga today, following a month of panic buying.

The boom started in this Baltic republic after the new Latvian parliament adopted a declaration to restore statehood early in May.

Although retail trade outlets possess the necessary resources, city authorities had to introduce rationing to prevent hoarding.

City residents are allowed to buy one kilo of cereals every two months and two kilos of flour and 0.5 kilos of pasta every four months.

The Riga Municipal Council announced that this minimum will be ensured for each resident.

Latvian Parties Attend First Roundtable

LD0106223990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1428 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga, 1 June (TASS)—The first attempt was made today to gather Latvia's various parties and movements, which have adopted diametrically opposed standpoints on many issues of life in the republic, at a "round table." The initiator of the meeting was the Communist Party that has retained its ideological unity with the CPSU. Six of the sixteen organizations which were invited responded. Representatives of the People's Front, and trade unions, Social Democrats, and a number of others did not come because of political differences of opinon with the Communist Party.

The leadership of the independent Communist Party which emerged as a result of a split in the ranks of what two months ago was a single organization, did come to the meeting but immediately asked their former colleagues to state their attitude to the declaration of independence. Alfred Rubiks, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, replied that the aim of the meeting was to look for common approaches to pressing and urgent problems and to look for points of contact in what unites rather than separates people. After this the independents left the auditorium, stressing that the divergence of views on points of principle makes dialogue impossible.

The main topic of the subsequent discussion was problems of ecology. Arvid Ulme, president of the Environmental Protection Club, spoke about the difficulties the "Green" movement in encountering. He was assured of support there and then. In particular, the rayon party committees are allocating some of their premises to the "Greens" with a lease fiee payment. It was decided to continue such meetings.

Baltic Role in 'Two-Plus-Four' Talks Proposed

90P50021 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 27 May 90 p 3

[Article by M. Butkov: "Arithmetic and Politics"]

[Text] "Two plus three plus four" was the formula for resolving the Baltic question proposed by Ch. Stankevichus, vice-president of Lithuania and deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, at a recently concluded seminar in Stockholm. His colleague from Latvia, D. Ivans; Estonian Minister of Foreign Affairs L. Meri, and many other political scientists and experts on international relations from various countries took part in the seminar, organized by the Swedish Foreign Policy Institute. The theme, naturally, was the Soviet Baltic republics' struggle for independence according to their understanding of the concept.

In the words of Ch. Stankevichus, two post-war problems still remain unresolved—the unification of Germany and the independence of the Baltics. However, while the resolution of the first problems is being successfully pursued according to the so-called "two-plus-four" talks, that is, between the two Germanies and the four victorious powers, the second problem is waiting for attention. He proposed a variant formula called "two plus three plus four" which would include the three Baltic republics in the negotiations on German unification.

The Baltic leaders noted that, having learned from history, the republics should act together in the spirit of the 12 May 1990 declaration.

The debates at the seminar divided the participants into two camps—the patient and impatient. The majority of speakers called for realism and restraint toward the complex question of independence. In particular, M. Wolfson, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet's Foreign Policy Committee, expressed the thought that without M. Gorbachev's reforms the struggle for the independence of the Baltic republics would have been impossible. The message from Pope John Paul II read here also served as a call for restraint and prudence. It emphasized the historical rights of the Baltics for independence, but warned against any steps threatening the progess of reform and democratization in the USSR.

Baltic Leaders Urge Coordinated Action

LD0306170890 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1600 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Excerpts] A meeting of Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian parliamentarians took place yesterday in Riga. Algimantas Norvila, a member of the founding group and a deputy of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, gave a detailed account of the event.

[Begin Norvilas recording] The meeting was important, friendly, and necessary. Heads of governments had met at a series of meetings, and now it has been decided that the cooperation should be held at parliamentary level. It has been decided on principle that a permanently functioning consultation among the Baltic states should be set up; this should consist of [representatives] of all three parliaments.

Possibilities for cooperation, that is, issues which are common to all and concern everybody have been discussed at the meeting.

The main task of the consultation, or the council, it may be called that, perhaps, would be to serve as a consultative body to the Baltic Council and to the representatives of our governments; it will exchange information about all foreign and domestic political nuances, about the possibilities which became available in the East or in the West; it will coordinate actions and steps and, of course, it will prepare materials and draft agreements for the Baltic Council. [passage omitted]

A telegram was sent to the United States, the U.S. President by the meeting informing about united actions of the Baltic parliament and about our united aspiration for independence.

In this case, this was not a step taken by Lithuanian or Latvia or Estonia individually; it was a document set up by all three [republics], by 8 million people. [end recording]

Baltic, Soviet Officials Discuss Power Situation

LD0206225690 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] Officials of power engineering institutions of the three Baltic countries and the Soviet Union held consultations in the Latvian capital, Riga. At the end of the meeting protocols were signed on the balance of electric power for 1991 and on the prospects of developing power engineering in the Baltic countries up to the year 2005. A coordinative council was set up to monitor the implementation of the decisions adopted at the meeting. The agreement may come in useful in the future, but meanwhile most Lithuanian industrial enterprises have been forced to change the rhythm of work and to stop working at night. The measure is an attempt to avoid an all-embracing energy crisis under the conditions when Lithuania's major energy sources, the Ignalina nuclear power station and the Elekrenai thermal power station are functioning at a minimum capacity. The oil that comes to Lithuania thanks to direct agreement with partners in various republics of the Soviet Union are sufficient only for the maintenance of the vitally important branches of the economy and for transport. Although arrangements have been made to sell petrol at commercial prices, these plans are likely to meet with difficulties in their realization due to transporation problems.

RSFSR

RSFSR Congress Discusses Deputy Chairmanships

LD0406073290 Moscow TASS in English 0716 GMT 4 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow June 4 TASS—Today's morning session of the Congress of People's Deputies of Russia continued to tackle the problem of who will be first vice president and vice president of the Russian parliament. The question remains unresolved for several days. Only two out of the needed four deputy presidents of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation were elected at the end of last week.

Boris Yeltsin proposed today to elect Deputy Ruslan Khazbulatov as his first vice president. Khazbulatov heads a chair at the Moscow Institute of National Economy named after Plekhanov (he was elected in one of the constituencies of the Checheno-Ingush Autonomous Republic, the northern Caucasus).

A candidate to the fourth vacant post will be nominated after the Khazbulatov's candidature is discussed. Then the elections of the two vice-presidents will be held.

The congress is also expected to discuss the formation of Russia's Supreme Soviet. A small preparatory group was set up for this purpose.

Moscow TV Relays 1 June Congress Proceedings

Isayev Elected Deputy Chairman

LD0106161490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1430 GMT on 1 June carries a recording of the 1 June session of the RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic) Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow.

Yeltsin opens the proceedings by asking deputies to stand and honor the Russian flag.

At 1432 GMT the chairman of the teller's commission reports the results of the election for the first deputy chairman of the RSFSR. Abdulatipov and Shtygashev received most votes but neither received sufficient to win.

At 1436 GMT the deputies are asked to approve the report. It is approved.

At 1438 GMT the teller's commission chairman reads the first protocol on results of elections for deputy chairmen. No candidate in the group of candidates covered by the protocol received the required number of votes for election, but Denisenko And Koryagina received most votes.

At 1439 GMT the deputies approve the first report by the teller's commission on elections for deputy chairmen.

At 1442 GMT the teller's chairman reads the second protocol on elections for deputy chairmen. In this group of candidates Boris Isayev receives sufficient votes and is elected deputy chairman.

At 1447 GMT the teller's commission chairman is questioned about some figures that do not add up. After checking, Boris Isayev's figures are reissued as 590 votes for and 355 votes against.

At 1450 GMT protocol No. 2 is approved. Yeltsin invites Boris Isayev to take his place in the presidium and to help him. Isayev does so to loud applause. Yeltsin shakes hands with Isayev.

At 1452 GMT the teller's commission reads protocol no. 3 on the election of deputy chairmen. No candidate received the required number of votes.

At 1455 GMT the protocol is accepted by 858 votes for, six against, and two abstentions.

Goryacheva Speaks

LD0106163790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1456 GMT on 1 June continues its recording of the 1 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At this time Yeltsin announces that two deputies received the most votes for first deputy chairman—Abdulatipov and Shtygashev. He lists all the candidates who are standing for the election of deputy chairmen. A deputy from floor asks for Goryacheva to speak.

At 1459 GMT Goryacheva takes the rostrum. She expresses thanks for the nomination. She says she understands the problems of outlying regions—crime, drunkenness, empty shops, ecological problems. The future Russian Federation should be a strong state as part of the Union, she says. National territories must be equal. All forces of the congress must consolidate. Yeltsin must have a cohesive team to deal effectively with the problems. Goryacheva lists various laws the congress will have to draft. The procedures for drafting must ensure wide consultation and clarity of the laws, she concludes.

At 1506 GMT, Yeltsin asks Sidorenko of the tellers' commission how long is needed to prepare ballot slips. Sidorenko says two hours.

At 1508 GMT Grachev speaks on behalf of the Secretariat. He asks that those who want to work in standing committees and commissions make themselves known. Yeltsin says non-Supreme Soviet members may also apply. There will be no session on Saturday, so that deputies can visit their constituencies. The next session will be Monday at 1000, Yeltsin announces.

At 1511 GMT Deputy Kuznetsov speaks about television coverage yesterday, showing Grachev whispering in Yeltsin's ear while a deputy was talking. Kuznetsov says he is against the rush to form commissions, and copying the Union model for them. Deputies who do not get speaking time should be able to have speeches published in written form, he says. Kuznetsov speaks against accepting the government's economic program without proper debate.

At 1515 GMT Deputy (Nelassov) says some points of the agenda have not been covered properly. He asks not to be lectured on behavior in the congress and makes some minor procedural points.

At 1518 GMT Yeltsin accepts criticism of Grachev and asks people not to approach him while deputies are speaking.

At 1519 GMT Deputy Manokhin from Novosibirsk speaks about the votes just taken, and how votes were split among representatives of different political groups. He says this shows that compromise has been reached. Yeltsin says they should avoid looking at things as competition among groups.

At 1522 GMT Deputy (Nesterov) appeals for briefer debates and better use of time when ballot votes are being prepared. Yeltsin says the latter point has already been taken. He asks deputies waiting to speak to sit down so that outstanding points of the agenda can be dealt with.

At 1524 GMT Deputy Kotenkov speaks about the amendment to standing orders concerning notes to the Secretariat requesting the floor. Several deputies comment about arrangements for speaking.

At 1540 GMT Yeltsin calls for a vote on cutting short debate. He says the voting board seems to be faulty—a massive majority are in favor of curtailing, but the board says "not adopted." Deputies are asked to register. The board says 678 deputies are present against a quorum of 707. Yeltsin asks deputies wandering about in corridors to come to the chamber and register. Deputies make minor points from rostrum while the quorum problem is being sorted out.

Sovereignty Declaration Debated

LD0106173590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1550 GMT on 1 June continues its recording of the 1 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At this time Deputy Bolotov speaks about needs of the educational sphere.

At 1558 GMT Yeltsin says deputies must stick to the point. He asks that written comments on drafts be handed in in good time. A vote is taken on refusing the floor for verbal comment if deputies have not given written comment about pre-published drafts. The motion is adopted by 633 to 113, with 767 deputies now present.

At 1602 GMT there is a 15-minute break in reportage. The program "Goodnight Children" is aired.

At 1619 GMT the recording resumes. Yeltsin announces that the registration of deputies by name will take place in two minutes time. He says that the results will be published.

At 1622 GMT Yeltsin announces that 811 deputies are present and a quorum is 707. So the session has a quorum.

At 1623 GMT Yeltsin asks what shall we do about Article 26 of the standing orders. Various deputies make brief points. Kotenkov resonds to the deputies' points. Yeltsin takes vote on the proposed Article of Standing Orders. The article is adopted by 629 votes for and 123 against.

At 1628 GMT Grachev of the Secretariat answers some questions.

At 1630 GMT Deputy Yunov, chairman of the Subcommittee on Drafting a Declaration of the State Sovereignty of the RSFSR, presents the subcommittee's draft. He explains that much legal help had been provided in drawing up the draft. He outlines the main principles in the draft. He says that besides the draft on sovereignty, several others documents will also later be presented for the deputies consideration. He asks deputies to submit to the drafting committee in written form any changes that deputies propose to the draft declaration on sovereignty. The draft says that the declaration will enter into force from the moment it is adopted by the First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies.

At 1639 GMT a deputy asks if the declaration has been coordinated with Article 12 of the USSR law of 26 April 1990 on demarcating the division of powers between the republics. Yunov says the declaration has not been specifically coordinated with that USSR law.

At 1640 GMT a deputy raises the point of divergences between the declaration and the present Constitution of the RSFSR. Yunov says that it is intended that the declaration will coincide with the future Constitution of the republic.

At 1646 GMT Yunov says that the draft has been drawn up on a constructive and compromise basis. Deputies continue to raise points about how the draft clashes with USSR legislation. Yunov says that the supremacy of RSFSR laws will apply in the territory of the USSR. On the subject of the RSFSR's right to freely leave the Union, Yunov says that this right already exists juridically.

At 1650 GMT, a 30-minute break is announced.

Armenian Request Read

LD0106191290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1651 GMT on 1 June continues its recording of the 1 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow. At this time, Yeltsin asks the comrades to be seated.

At 1652 GMT Yeltsin calls for debate to be brief; the deputies agree. One deputy speaks from floor asking for better advance notice of topics, so they can prepare. He sees inconsistencies in the drafts. A deputy from Vitebsk suggests that a point on state language be included. Yunov explains why deputies have received the latest version of draft only today, and says the language question was considered. A deputy asks about right of secession from the RSFSR of autonomous formations; Yunov suggests this should be the subject of another law. A deputy from Yakutia complains of lack of mention of little peoples. Deputy Klyuyev says sovereignty must apply all the way down to enterprise level, and suggests a point covering referendums. Deputy Volkov queries the formulation of the draft language. Yunov says the present formulations shows the direction in which the republic intends to go.

At 1708 GMT Yeltsin says it has been proposed to end the questions and to give all remaining points to the Secretariate so that a vote can be taken on Monday.

At 1709 GMT Yeltsin calls for a vote on ending question-time: 740 for, 46 against, seven abstain.

At 1710 GMT Yeltsin asks those in favor of handing in written notes to the Secretariat to vote.

At 1711 GMT Deputy (Kashokin) from Moscow takes the floor and says that people should be allowed to express their views. Yeltsin says that there are two proposals and he invites others to speak.

At 1712 GMT Deputy Konstantinovks stresses the need for adopting the document now and for giving deputies the opportunity to express their views on the document. Deputy (Sayenko) takes the floor and says that the document needs further work, taking into account the proposals. Deputy Beloglazov supports the views that more work on the document is required and that discussion should took place now. Deputy (Guskov) says the document is "raw", not ready. Deputy Gritsenko highlights the signficance of the document and says that serious thought is still required and that decisions on it should be postponed until Monday.

At 1716 GMT Yeltsin says that he supports the view that the document should be solidified by taking into account today's proposals. Who favors the commissions considering the proposals and presenting the document again for discussion? he asks. The deputies vote: 730 for, 103 against, 12 abstain, total 845.

At 1718 GMT Yeltsin asks the deputies to vote again: This time, 691 are in favor, 55 against, 15 abstain, 761 total. The document is returned to the commission for reworking considering today's proposals.

At 1720 GMT Yeltsin says that the teller's commission announced that Isayev was elected deputy of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. He reads out the decision that Isayev should be deputy chairman and asks deputies to vote: 778 for, 27 against, eight abstain, 813 total. Isayev is deputy chairman of the RSFSR.

At 1723 GMT Sidernko, chairman of the teller's commission, explains the procedure for the repeat voting on deputy chairmanship of the RSFSR.

At 1724 GMT Yeltsin says that the chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet had telephoned and asked the RSFSR not to adopt decisions on Armenia. Yeltsin says: "Comrades, for your information, the chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet has telephoned and requested that the Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation not adopt a statement or appeal on Armenia. [applause] I think that there is no need to vote on this. One needs to agree to this request."

At 1725 GMT a Dagestan deputy takes the floor, complaining that yesterday 115 people's deputies did not have the opportunity to take part in voting for the chairman of the RSFSR. Various deputies take the floor to inform their colleagues of deputy's meetings today.

Yeltsin on Party Membership

LD0106192790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1727 GMT on 1 June continues its recording of the 1 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At this time, Deputy Voronenko of the 753d constituency, says the following: "Comrades, we have just heard a request, as conveyed by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, from the chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, that we do not discuss the Armenian issue. But who saw this morning's SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA? It carries a note from which it is plainly evident that members of the families of servicemen are asking the Congress of Russian People's Deputies to express their opinion and adopt measures to protect women and children and representatives of Russian nationality in Armenia, because their lives are in danger. It seems to me, Boris Nikolayevich, that we cannot bypass this request which is made precisely to the congress. In one form or another, we need to return to these events and express our view."

At 1728 GMT Yeltsin responds: "We shall instruct the currently functioning Council of Ministers to establish contacts accordingly for some measures to be taken there to limit, so to speak, or ensure the safety of citizens. It seems that there is no need to adopt an appeal. Moreover, discussion of this matter will intensify matters, so to speak, even more. This is already the experience shown by the previous Union congresses and sessions."

At 1729 GMT other deputies take the floor and invite their colleagues to attend various group meetings.

At 1730 GMT Yeltsin says he has received a question from Deputy Sayenko on the significance for him of being a delegate to the 28th congress in view of the fact that he has said he will leave the party. Yeltsin states: "I would like to tell you that I personally have received a question from People's Deputy Sayenko. What is the point, he asks, of my being a delegate to the 28th congress of the CPSU since I had said that it was necessary to suspend one's membership in the party after the elections. I have been elected as a delegate to the 28th Party Congress. I want to voice my principled position at the congress on questions of radical perestroyka and the reconstruction of the party, and I have a right to do this. After the 28th Party Congress, I shall make a decision."

At 1731 GMT Yeltsin announces a break for voting, and there is a break in the broadcast of the recorded congress proceedings.

From 1732 to 1744 GMT, interviews with RSFSR deputies are broadcast.

Estonian Leader Speaks

LD0106200890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1745 GMT on 1 June continues its recording of the 1 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow. At this time, coverage of the session proper resumes. The deputies register: 12 short of 707 quorum first time; 759 present second time. Sidorenko is invited to speak.

At 1753 GMT Sidorenko reports on the result of the vote for first deputy chairman of RSFSR Supreme Soviet. 899 votes were cast. Neither Abdulatipov nor Shtygashev gained the necessary number of votes. Deputies endorse the report by 765 to 16 with three abstentions.

At 1756 GMT Sidorenko reports on voting in the election for deputy chairman. 929 votes were cast. Goryacheva received 587 votes, Koryagina 279. Thus Goryacheva has been elected. Deputies endorse the report by 691 to 52 with six abstentions.

At 1800 GMT Yeltsin reads a resolution appointing Goryacheva and puts it to vote. It is adopted by 720 to 50 with nine abstentions. Yeltsin asks Goryacheva to take her place on the presidium, which she does.

At 1802 GMT, Grachev reports on the results of voting for another deputy chairman. 927 ballots are cast, one is invalid. Neither Shakhray nor Yarov gained enough votes. The report is endorsed by 766 to 13 with four abstentions.

At 1807 GMT Yeltsin suggests a break until Mondav in selection of deputy chairmen. He gives the floor to Estonian delegation leader, Lauristin.

At 1808 GMT Lauristin recalls that the RSFSR Congress is discussing Russian sovereignty. "Don't be afraid to go forwards," she says. She has a message from the Estonian Supreme Soviet: The Estonian people have been and will remain your neighbor. We are fighting together to overcome the past. We have no claims against the Russian people. Let our relations develop on a basis of equality. We suggest forming a joint commission of our Supreme Soviets. Greetings to Yeltsin on his election.

Special Congress Proposed

LD0106203990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1813 GMT on 1 June continues its recording of the 1 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies held in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At this time, Yeltsin says a few bits of "other business" remain to be tidied up. Yeltsin reads out a procedural suggestion from a deputy. It is accepted by a vote. Deputy Domina complains about an injustice she feels was done to her at the conciliation commission meeting. Yeltsin rejects the suggestion that his interview for Moscow Television be published, saying we don't want to create any cults, and paper must be saved. He complains that some notes have illegible signatures, and asks that the constituency number be included in the future.

At 1824 GMT Shinkaretskiy reports on what has been happening at the Moscow Soviet concerning sale on presentation of passports and various oblasts' refusal to supply food to Moscow in response: He gives figures for the consumption of various foods in Moscow. Yeltsin asks him to be concise. Shinkaretskiy has nothing of substance to report.

At 1829 GMT an unidentified member of the Secretariat announces some deputies' written questions for ministers on the various topics.

At 1833 GMT a deputy asks when the formation of the Supreme Soviet is to be discussed; proposals will be distributed on Monday, says Yeltsin, as will a schedule for the whole week. Various minor points are raised from the floor.

At 1838 GMT Deputy (Oluzhko) asks Yeltsin if a draft is being prepared on an alternative verison of the transition to market economy. (Oluzhko) says: "Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich, Deputy (Oluzhko), [word indistinct] Oblast. Before the break, we handed a note to the Secretariat asking that perhaps you would provide instructions or somehow help so that documents with alternative versions of a transfer to market relations would be distributed to deputies. We would like you to express your opinion on this issue."

At 1839 GMT Yeltsin responds: "Well, the documents are being prepared, and we will distribute these documents before discussion of this issue." Yeltsin goes on to say: "Because, of course, there are voluminous documents among them. The government report alone is 130 pages. Here certain deputies have also put forward the following proposal: Does it not make sense, bearing in mind that this has now touched practically all the republics and the issue is so serious that it has really come to an impasse at the Union Supreme Soviet, to convene an extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR on two issues, precisely on this government program on the transfer to a market economy and the second issue of a Union treaty. The RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies has, in accordance with the Constitution, the right. If we adopt a decision, then the congress must convene. What do you think? "

In response, Deputy Aleksandr Vishnikovr, constituency 266, Arkhangelsk, states: "I consider that the proposal we have just heard deserves attention, but we should return to it after we have read the government report and made sense of it, and after that, perhaps, return to this issue."

At 1842 GMT a deputy at the rostrum complains of the unproductive rate of work of the congress. Further minor points are raised from various deputies.

At 1856 GMT Yeltsin says that two alternative proposals are being drawn up and that they will be presented on Monday. He says that a conciliatory concession is necessary and says that the deputies will be given a work schedule for the week on Monday.

At 1858 GMT Deputy Zhigulin takes the floor and complains of the lack of discipline in the work of the congress and makes proposals for speeding up its work.

At 1859 GMT Yeltsin says that he has already received the approval of the deputies for discussing on Monday candidacies for the posts not elected today. He also says that delays in the work of the congress are only to be expected. He asks for deputies to vote on registering by name and for a date on the candidates to be published in the press. They votes: 298 for, 356 against, 19 abstain, total 673. The proposal is not adopted. A deputy speaks on the work of the conciliatory commission and proposes the rotation of those in this commission. At 1904 GMT Yeltsin announces a break until Monday.

Estonian Leader Addresses Congress

LD0106215290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1808 GMT 1 June 90

[Speech by Maryu Yokhannesovna Lauristin, deputy chairman and speaker of the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet and USSR people's deputy, at the 1 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed envoys of the peoples of Russia, allow me cordially to greet your congress, a congress of historic significance for our common fates, in the name of one of your smallest neighbors, the people of Estonia. Today, you are discussing at your congress a historic document—a declaration of the of the sovereignty of Russia.

From our own experience, we know what contradictions, what most difficult economic, political, and social problems you are taking on by this. But we want to tell you: don't be afraid, go forward—since the strength of a people aroused and regarding itself as a genuine master on its own land is increased tenfold, and it acquires amazing energy and vitality, helping it to overcome all difficulties.

We wish you this vitality and self-creation. We are sure Russia's path towards freedom and self-determination will simultaneously also open up new opportunities for the free development of economic, cultural, humanitarian and political relations between us. Allow me to pass on to you an address from our Supreme Soviet to your congress, which says, among other things:

We have entered upon the common, difficult path of liberation of our peoples from such a sytsem...onto a path of creating a society in which the people choose their representatives by free choice and the democratically representatives serve their people. We have entered onto a path leading from material and spiritual limitation to a life worthy of man.

The Estonian people have been and remain your neighbor. Not only because of their small number, but out of common sense, the Estonian people have always, in all their deeds, respected the interests of the people of Russia. Together we are struggling to free ourselves from an onerous inheritance. We have been equally torn by a harsh regime which deprived peoples of the right to express their will.

A policy with its roots in the past deprived Estonia of its liberty 50 years ago and brought Russia to stagnation. Now we are liberating ourselves from this stagnation. The Estonian people do not make any claims on the Russian people. For onerous trials fell to both our lot and yours. We declare that all those who disseminate national strife in Estonia do not express the will of the Estonian republic. The Estonian people want to be an equal ally and good neighbor of the people of Russia. May our economic, social, and cultural relations develop on an equal and mutually beneficial basis.

We respect and recognize the interests of the people of Russia and hope that you will understand our aspiration to be an independent state. We propose settling up a joint commission of our Supreme Soviets to deepen cooperation of our peoples, proceeding from mutual interests. We wish you success in your activity for the good of Russia, for the sake of improving the life of your people and the creation of genuinely good-neighborly relations between our peoples.

Allow me also to congratulate Boris Nikolayevich on his election as chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Russia.

TASS Roundup of 1 June Congress Session

LD0106162290 Moscow TASS in English 1605 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksyonov, Kirill Dibrova and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 1 (TASS)—The second round of voting in the election of deputies to the president of the Supreme Soviet has filled an additional post, leaving two of the four pasts vacant. Only two contenders got more than half of the votes—Boris Isayev, 55, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Chelyabinsk Regional Soviet (Southern Urals); and Svetlana Goryacheva, 43, a lawyer from Vladivostok. At Yeltsin's invitation, they both took their seats in the Presidium of the Congress. An Estonian delegation greeted the congress today. Marju Lauristin, assistant speaker of the Estonian parliament and people's deputy to the USSR and Estonia, urged deputies of the Russian Federation "not to be afraid to move forward", because "the awakened people who feel that they are now true masters of their land are ten times stronger." She described the first congress as "historic in its significance for our common destinies".

At the end of today's session Yeltsin asked for a break until Monday. He wants to use this time for consultations and to proposed new candidatures for his assistants on June 4.

Although over the past few days some deputies urged their colleagues to envigorate the work of the congress, the republic parliament will have two free days this weekend (two previous Saturdays were working days). Judging by the results of the registration, the occasional lack of quorum at the congress hall today was because some deputies had already left for their constituencies. Conferences of the Soviet Communist Party are to be held soon in some of the regions, and deputies want to tell people about the first republican congress.

Article Views Congress Sovereignty Debate

90UN1950A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 May 90 p 4

[Article by S. Kiselev: "Russia: Taking Care of Itself"]

[Text] **The Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation named the candidates for the post of chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet yesterday.**

....And finally, following the principle of "democracy in alphabetical order," the Russian Congress of People's Deputies reached the final letter "Ya" and ended the debate on the question of sovereignty. Period?

But what sort of a thing, properly speaking, is sovereignty? If we translate this word from Latin, that wise language of lawyers and doctors (and it is worth doing so if only because we are speaking about Russia), then it turns out that for the last three days the Congress of People's Deputies has been arguing about autonomy for the Russian Federation. About independence.

That is a sweet word—independence! It is a resonant, alluring word which cries out to be put on a banner. And it must have an exclamation point—Independence! But that which flies well on banners is still insufficient for politics: The slogan "works" only when a developed political program is standing with it. Therefore we will not hurry with the exclamation points. We will begin with questions.

Independence from whom? Who is binding the will of the Russian Federation? They believe in the Baltic

region that they were occupied and that secession from the Union is the only answer to the problem of sovereignty—but where will Russia secede to? And where from? And who has occupied it? When? In other national districts they sometimes speak about "imperial colonialism," meaning that the colonizer is Russia—what can Russia itself answer to that?

While trying to answer these questions the congress discovered very serious divergences in the views of the people's deputies. That is to say that when it came time to vote whether to include the issue of sovereignty on the agenda, there was an "absolute majority" and a slight euphoria over the record number of votes (1004!). But as soon as the matter came down to discussing the essence of the issue, there was complete pluralism. At times it seemed that the deputies were speaking about completely opposite things and calling them the same thing—"sovereignty."

For some people sovereignty is something along the line of economic accountability [khozraschet] at the level of the republic. And with great enthusiasm they talk about plans, treaties, and deliveries, criticizing the central planning organs, the ministries, and the departments at the same time. The latter are the ones that "undercalculated," "infringed upon the interests of the peoples of the Federation," and "robbed." But if we can free ourselves from them, if for example instead of the USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] we enact a Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Gossnab, then paradise will set in on Russian soil...

Others see the root of all our problems in the absence of political sovereignty. "How is it," they say indignantly, "that Russia does not have its own Communist Party or Komsomol?"

A third group goes further than all the rest and talks about state sovereignty. And even about boundless sovereignty, to the point of the secession of the Federation from the Union. (Did V. Rasputin think that his joke at the first USSR Congress of People's Deputies about the secession of Russia from the USSR would become a serious political argument so quickly?)

There were also other approaches at the congress. To some degree they can be reduced to the three points of view that I have enumerated. They are increasingly complex and intricate. But nonetheless if we move away from the apparent diversity and try to extract something that is similar, it turns out that according to the deputies there is some abstract center to blame for all our misfortunes. In my opinion all the deputies converge here. But not all of them draw conclusions from this, and not all of them have decided upon the following step.

And this step is simple—there is no sovereignty by halves. And if the "Center" really is to blame in all our misfortunes, then we need to establish a sovereign Russian state which would have as the source of its power not a law which has been granted from above but rather those men who have been delegated by its people. And that means an independent legislature and the supremacy of RSFSR law on its territory. It means an independent economic policy, which is only possible where the republic's ownership of land, mineral wealth, and resources have been affirmed. It means an independent foreign policy and equal interaction (without intermediaries) with the other republics on the basis of a new Union treaty. It means much more, including—I do not exclude it—an end to the way in which perestroyka has developed until now. After that is another story. There would be a declaration of sovereignty and a political leader able to embody it.

For the present there is neither a declaration nor a chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. In my opinion, the first week of the congress will go down in history of parliamentarianism as a week of unresolved problems. Aside from the agenda, there has not been a single issue which the congress has brought to its logical conclusion. To a document. They discussed the administration's report—there is no concluding document. They argued about sovereignty—four draft documents were sent to the editorial commission, but a decision was postponed until next week. The congress even began to discuss its own rules twice—and the matter still has not been brought to a conclusion.

One gets the impression that all these "half-finished products" have been moved to the future in order that they may be set right with the active participation of the new chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Voting booths have been set up in a line in Georgiyevskiy Hall of the Kremlin since the very first day of the congress. Soon they will finally be put into operation. Yesterday the deputies started on the search for their new leader and began it with such enthusiasm that it was as if they were proving to themselves that they would see the business through to the end.

They nominated 13 candidates. The headline "A Baker's Dozen for Russia," was promptly created in the congress's press center. But apparently none of the journalists has used it. Five of the candidates withdrew from the race: V. Vorotnikov, L. Voronin, Yu. Manayenkov, N. Borontsov, and D. Volkogonov. Eight aspirants remained. Three of them were well-known even before the congress. They are A. Vlasov, B. Yeltsin, and I. Polozkov. I would like to briefly present the remaining five: N. Malkov—first secretary of the Chita Oblast CPSU Committee; V. Sokolov—second secretary of the Krasnoyarsk Kray CPSU Committee; Yu. Zhiltsov—chairman of the Altay Kray Congress of People's Deputies Executive Committee; and V. Stepanov—chairman of the Karelian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium. And there is something special about the last. Vladimir Ivanovich Morokin nominated himself, putting down "an Obolenskiy on a Russian scale." He is Ukrainian, nonparty, and a senior instructor at the Kazan Aviation Institute...

So, eight people for one seat. These people are speaking before the congress with their programs, and the congress will decide under whose leadership Russia will begin to take care of itself.

RSFSR Health Minister on Costs, Changes

90US0984A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 21, 26 May-1 June 90 p 6

[Article by RSFSR Health Minister A. Potapov: "Health As a Component of Public Welfare"]

[Text] **What is the top priority among the things that have to be done to change the health care situation in Russia? Here is what RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Health Minister A. Potapov thinks about the issue.**

The health care situation in today's Russia is very complicated. Over 20 million citizens of 43 cities are exposed to hazardous industrial and automobile emissions. The amount of poisonous substances released into the atmosphere is on average 340 kg per person a year; but in the Russian republic this figure is over 400 kg.

Four and a half million people are working under hazardous conditions in the republic, and women make up about a third of this number. The quality of the drinking water and of foods is not improving; in some areas it is even deteriorating. Contamination of the water and produce with pesticides and nitrates is on the rise. All of this seriously damages the people's health. This is especially true of children, whose immunity is consistently decreasing.

At the same time they continue the policy of "making people happy" by introducing pay adjustments, by increasing their leave time, by giving them milk to compensate for the hazardous conditions, etc.

From Budgeting—to Insurance

The RSFSR Ministry of Health has researched the cause-and-effect relations between diseases and technological factors. In accordance with the results of the research, the ministry designed a number of measures aimed at the sanitary improvement of our environment. But there is no current law that would regulate social relations in the area of providing for the sanitary welfare of the people. We hope that such a law will be passed by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in the near future.

Any radical changes in our sphere can be possible only if we change the principles and methods according to which the health care system is financed. Any changes in our situation come slowly, though lately our allocations have increased: by 1990 we were given R14.3 billion compared to R9.1 billion at the end of 1986. However, this increase in financing was used to cover inflation processes rather than to help our development. The health care system budget per se can currently provide only for those people in good health.

It is necessary to switch from the fully-financed system to a mixture of financing and insurance. For that we will need to use allocations from enterprises, collective farms, and other organizations, including cooperatives. We have to introduce personal insurance for people as well as individual donations.

However, we are trying to find ways to spend our present money rationally. We are implementing a transfer to a new economic mechanism based on planned norms of expenditures per person per year.

But we have been doing this so far without taking into account regional, climatic, ecological, and other features, and that is socially unjust. We have to make corresponding corrections in this issue as soon as possible. By our estimates this figure should be R250-R300 by 1995, compared to R89.8 in the current year.

About the Legal and Economic Guarantees

We are very hopeful for our new economic mechanism, but even when we employ it we need well-outlined legal and economic guarantees.

We have to heighten the prestige of our profession, we have to design and pass a law on the status of doctors, their place in society, compensation for their work, and their life conditions.

To strengthen our out-patient services we will give those clinics our finances, materials, and best doctors.

We will continue setting up diagnostic centers in all areas. Such centers should improve the diagnostic as well as the medical treatment of the patients. There are 14 such centers functioning in the RSFSR at present.

We plan to decrease the number of hospital beds and create nursing homes for intensive and restorative medical care, and for final recovery. Together with this we need to expand the hospitals for the chronically ill and the old.

We are organizing paramedical/birthing stations in all collective and state farm centers or, in some places, doctor's clinics or rural hospitals.

It has become clear that the medical commission for determination of disability has to be handed over from the Ministry of Social Security to the Ministry of Health. The patients can only benefit from this.

The policy of the countrywide annual preventive medical checkups was pronounced to be a salvation for our sinking health care but it only succeeded in making us lie to ourselves and to the public. In our opinion we have to resort instead to screening risk groups. That will enable us to use our money in a more rational way and at the same time it will help us to diagnose occupational, cardiovascular, and oncological problems at earlier stages.

Results of Treatment as a Criterion

The work of our research sector should be seriously restructured. If we combine similar-type institutions in the Interregional Science and Technology Committee and the Science and Production Association we will be able to stop duplicate work on a number of similar insignificant projects. Science and research workers will be able to concentrate on the crucial medical problems. It seems promising to us to gradually transfer our science and research institutes to financial autonomy.

We started working on the interregional, special purpose complex program Health. It has been planned for the 13th five-year period and will deal with the medical-social problems of Russia in the nearest future. But the program will prove effective only if it is of a governmental character and given the corresponding financial and material support. We think that such a program should be discussed and adopted by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and should become a component of the RSFSR plan for socioeconomic development.

We think that we should stop basing our plans on investment in health care. Instead we should base our planning on results of treatment.

Radical changes in government policy concerning health care require that a new RSFSR law be urgently designed and adopted. Such a law on health care will replace the old RSFSR law adopted almost 20 years ago, which does not provide for our current needs. This law should provide a legal guarantee to protect the people's health in our republic. It should hold society, the government, and all its structures increasingly responsible for the health of every individual and of the entire population in general. This will give us the opportunity to come very close to the creation of a public health care system, which does not exist at present in the country. We have to remember that health is a component of the welfare of the people.

Russian Trade Union Body on 'Market' Referendum

PM0106135790 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 31 May 90 Single Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Solving Problems With the People's Participation; The Russian Trade Union Center's Position"]

[Text] At a sitting of the Federation of Independent RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Trade Unions [FIRTU] Council Presidium a document was adopted expressing the attitude of the Russian trade union center to the Union government's concept of the switch to a regulated market economy.

The document says that reports from trade union organizations, labor collectives, and from various regions and sectors of the RSFSR's national economy testify to their understanding of the need to radicalize economic reform, to speed up the switch to market relations, without which it is impossible to make tangible progress in improving our life. At the same time alarm is expressed, and also disagreement with the government's concept which is not an integrated, scientifically validated program underpinned by a package of legislative acts, but basically amounts to a general rise in retail prices throughout the country and partial compensation for these.

A negative attitude in many labor collectives has been created by the rise in tariffs for everyday and municipal services and passenger transportation where compensation is not provided, and also by the idea to create a housing market without reliable social guarantees for people on the housing list, particularly among the badly off sections of the population. The concept essentially ignores such vital spheres as public health, education, and culture. The mechanism by which prices would function in market conditions is unclear.

The publication of the government document led to a sharp increase in negative tendencies in society, and to an unprecedented flurry of demand for foodstuffs and essential goods. The little that was left on store shelves disappeared from them. In these conditions the local organs of power in a number of regions are introducing trade only upon presentation of passports or visitors cards, which is leading to self-isolation and barter. These alarming phenomena testify not to movement toward the market, but rather to a slide back to premarket relations, to barter. People are feeling increasing uncertainty about the future.

Expressing the will and mood of trade union organizations of many RSFSR regions, the FIRTU Council Presidium states that the proposed version of the USSR Government's concept regarding the switch to the market is not supported by the RSFSR trade union center. We believe it expedient, the document says, to organize a permanent "roundtable" to discuss with government and trade union participation the economic mechanism and measures of social protection in conditions of the switch to the market economy. "The roundtable" could function at Union, republic, and regional levels, which would make it possible to identify opinions and tendencies and to take account of constructive proposals when looking at economic reform from another viewpoint.

In the conditions which have taken shape, the FIRTU Council Presidium believes, there is no other way but to backtrack from the announced timetable for raising retail prices. The council is making this proposal to the USSR Supreme Soviet and also to the First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. The nationwide RSFSR concept of the switch to the market must be formulated and discussed taking account of the republic's regional differences. The central part of it, the document says, is the legislative coordination of interrelated problems: prices—the subsistence minimum—indexation of wages and income.

The result of the discussion of the draft economic reform at the "roundtable" must be a nationwide referendum

which could be held in the union republics. Today it is extremely necessary to explain to the people that market relations are the only chance to get our economy out of the economic crisis, but at the same time the negative consequences and difficulties which can be expected at the transitional stage should be honestly identified. All the detailed calculations connected with price reform and compensation as applied to groups and sectors of the population with different levels of income should be published.

It was proposed that the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies discuss this question and present it and also the results of the discussion on the draft economic reform to the Second Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies.

Moscow Democratic Platform Conference Held

PM3005144990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 29 May 90 p 1

[A. Tsatsuyev report: "On the 'Democratic Platform' Platform"]

[Text] Supporters of the "Democratic Platform in the CPSU" held a regional conference 26-27 May in Moscow. Approximately 350 people from Moscow and Moscow Oblast took part in its work.

Our correspondent was told by M. Kobrin, editor of DEMOKRATICHESKAYA PLATFORMA, that this conference is one phase in the preparations for the Second All-Union Conference to be held in Moscow 16-17 June.

The regional conference adopted a "Program Statement" and defined the "Democratic Platform's" positions for the 28th CPSU Congress.

"Democratic Platform" supporters confirmed that they advocate the creation of a democratic parliamentary state based on equality for all economic forms, including private ownership. In the ethnic sphere the "Democratic Platform" advocates the consistent implementation of national sovereignty for the republics, including their right to self-determination and to secede from the USSR.

Several tendencies within the "Democratic Platform" came to light at the conference.

Thus, one negligible group believes that democratic processes within the party are proceeding very slowly, nothing can be changed within the CPSU, and for that reason it is necessary to leave it before the 28th Congress and create their own party.

The supporters of another position—and a sociological poll showed that they are in the majority—favor remaining within the CPSU and securing the election of "Democratic Platform" members to the congress and there announcing their program documents. They should only leave the CPSU if it proves impossible to secure democratic changes at the congress.

There is also a third group. Its viewpoint favors remaining within the party and continuing the struggle to democratize it irrespective of how the congress goes.

Moscow City Soviet Decisions on Assets Reported

PM0106142590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 May 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Moscow City Soviet Shows Character"]

[Text] Moscow, 29 May—Although the "Moscow" deputies' group stated at the morning sitting of the Moscow City Soviet session that the effectiveness of the session's work had considerably declined, the last few days of sittings have abounded in decisions. The Interim Provision on Cooperative Activity passed by the previous Moscow City Soviet, and the executive committee decision on transferring buildings and premises from the assets of rayispolkoms [rayon soviet executive committees] to the assets of CPSU and Komsomol raykoms [rayon committees] were rescinded.

The question of the mass media was examined. The session deemed invalid the Moscow City CPSU Committee's unilateral decision removing the Moscow City Soviet's name from the masthead of the newspaper MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA and confirmed the rights of the capital's soviet as cofounder of the newspaper. It is planned to hold talks with all interested parties on the working procedure for mass media in Moscow.

It was also deemed essential to establish newspapers, radio and television programs, and other news media reflecting the Moscow City Soviet's position, and to set up its own printing works and news and publishing center.

Moscow Plenum Views Upcoming CPSU Congress

PM3105124390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 90 Second Edition p 2

[PRAVDA correspondent Yu. Kazmin report: "Stance Held by the Capital's Communists"]

[Text] Moscow—A Moscow City CPSU Committee [Gorkom] Plenum was held yesterday. Its participants clarified the date for the 28th Moscow communists' conference—it is scheduled for mid-June. Addenda were made to the agenda and draft documents submitted for the conference's consideration were discussed. The plenum's participants examined the results of the elections of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress and the 28th municipal party conference.

Yu.A. Prokofyev, Moscow CPSU Gorkom first secretary, delivered a report at the plenum.

As a result of a trenchant and principled discussion the plenum largely agreed with the draft position for the CPSU Congress and the proposals for the draft party statutes presented by the Moscow city party organization. Moscow CPSU Gorkom commissions were

instructed to examine the proposals and comments made at the plenum in conjunction with the delegates' club working groups. These proposals and comments will be submitted to the conference for consideration after the finishing touches have been put to them.

The Moscow party organization's draft position for the 28th CPSU Congress acknowledges that democratization is developing against a backdrop of general economic, political, and social crisis, a decline in trust in authority, a reduction in the CPSU's political prestige, and even an increase in anticommunist sentiments.

It was pointed out that the ideological foundation of the CPSU presupposes the enrichment of Marxism with the contemporary achievements of civilization and the elaboration of a new concept for socialism and the communist perspective. The plenum's participants spoke with particular concern of the unacceptability of factionalism within the party and said that the capital's party organization sees a split among Communists as a very great danger for the CPSU.

The Moscow CPSU Gorkom plenum adopted a special resolution in connection with the USSR Government's proposed concept for the transition to regulated market relations; the resolution says that this step is necessary under present conditions and may help extricate the country from the economic crisis. At the same time decisions that affect the country's future and concern the interests of literally all strata of the population and every citizen must be discussed with the people and representatives of public organizations and political trends. For that reason the plenum believes that, first, there can only be a final decision on the question of a phased transition to a regulated market after a national referendum and, second, the question of the party's policy in conditions of a market economy needs to be discussed at the CPSU Congress.

The Moscow Communists' plenum appealed to Moscow Soviet and rayon soviet deputies to renounce confrontation and channel their efforts into resolving Muscovites' urgent problems.

Report on Continuing Panic-Buying in Leningrad

LD0106175890 Leningrad Maritime Press Service in Russian 1400 30 May 90

[Text] Paradoxically, it is glasnost which has been the main reason for that panic buying which is now evident in all the city's shops. Despite the fact that commerce is being carried out exclusively by passport and the sale of the majority of goods to one person is restricted; sales of flour, for instance, have increased by a factor of three, groats by a factor of four, and butter by a factor of two. The run on salt and matches which we experienced not so long ago is completely incomprehensible.

Appeals to common ssense do not work, either. The price increases on which N.I. Ryzhkov spoke on 24 May at a joint sitting of chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet are only a suggestion. It still has to be discussed by all the people. Clarifications that the sell-by-date of the majority of foodstuffs, especially groceries, is limited to several months do not help either. What housewife can afford such an extravagance as to stock up with groats and flour, in order to throw out what her family has not managed to eat up by autumn?

Members of the Main Trade Department [as received] have appealed to the Leningrad Soviet Executive Committee Planning Commission to set up and strictly regulate the average daily sale of practically all types of foodstuffs. In the opinion of the specialists, it is necessary to fix a level which does not exceed the average daily sale of goods for the first four months of the current year, when not only was there enough for everyone, there was the opportunity to set up unusually large reserves and to ensure the uninterrupted supply to shops of those same groats, flour, and butter. Now this issue is to be discussed at a forthcoming sitting of the Leningrad Soviet session.

Leningrad Communists Urge Referendum on Party

LD0406082290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0200 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Delegates at the conference of Leningrad communists who support the democratic platform of the party have called for a party wide referendum on the eve of the 28th congress of the CPSU. They proposed a discussion of the issues of the structure of party, its name, and party property, which those attending the conference believe ought to be handed over to the soviets of people's deputies.

Sobchak Elected Leningrad Mayor

90UN1971A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian No 21, 26 May 90 p 1

[Article by Tatyana Menshikova: "Anatoliy Sobchak"]

[Text] The elections are over in Mariinskiy Palace...

On the whole we knew the nomenklatura "journeys from Petersburg to Moscow." Not always with a happy ending. Now Moscow has paid the debt and returned Leningrad to the people of Leningrad. But with that Moscow seems to have lost one of its most brilliant parliamentarians.

So, you see, the people of Leningrad have nothing to regret, even Sobchak!

But it is true that the glory of discovering him rests with Moscow.

His is a special kind of popularity. There is not a trace of populism in it or of any desire "to turn with the wind" and play on the people's emotions. His cold logic does not just attract, it also annoys some of his colleagues.

Why is it so? Is it because arguing with him is difficult and sometimes dangerous—he will shower you at once with precisely phrased reasons. We became convinced of

this when we were watching the duels Anatoliy Aleksandrovich was fighting without any awe of rank.

However, whether people accept him or not, they are not guided in their decisions by his tough polemical manner.

When the predecessors of our present parliamentarians used to meet in Tavricheskiy Palace, one of the tsar's courtiers once let drop the following comment: "Petty lawyers, some doctors—are these the statesmen?" The Supreme Soviet is definitely no Duma. But the saying, far from new, "the truth is found in civil service" is still of great help for those who think you can make people listen to reason only if you hold a high-ranking position. What is meat for a boss is poison for a professor. Is this a partial explanation for the storm of accusations, including lobbyism, dumped on Sobchak (the democrats seem to have attired him in the toga of law enforcer, and he was won over)?

Such attacks, fortunately, only add to the popularity as well as the attempts to find the sinful among other deputies. Another reason why Sobchak seems rather protected against attacks is his standing all by himself, outside all clans and groups. This independence of his even perplexes some weaklings who have to belong to one or another group. Sobchak is not with the left or with the right. He has THE RIGHT.

The right today means the battlefield as well as a peaceful weapon against the commandments from above and the illegitimate usurping of power.

Sobchak stands for the right and for democracy. That was why he voted for the president's post and for the new structures—for the sake of defeating the old structures.

No other but the appointees of the old structures reduced the great city to the level of a provincial town. They seem to have forgotten that apart from being the cradle of the revolution, it is also the cradle of great Russia and it was from here that Russia made its first step into Europe. The city now brings tears to your eyes because of its state of neglect, because of the number of the poor and of the lumpen, because of its communal slums. The city amazes by the stoic attitude of the intellectuals who are fed up with the indifference of the authorities. But in spite of all the expulsions and banishments, the city keeps reproducing its intellectuals with some enviable consistency.

Does he know of any remedies? His intentions, in any case, are undoubtedly on a European scale. He thinks that the city should earn its own living and for that it has to become an open economic zone and to attract foreign capital.

But this prompts the following question: What will the Smolny think about it? It seems that such capital is not very much "in favor" with the Smolny. It is not a simple matter to find a mutual understanding with the ruling party which no longer governs the democratically elect Soviets. What now? They say that the Smolny reacted calmly to the first "tricks" of the Leningrad Soviet. They say that they are ready "to cooperate along the Sobchak line."

The rebellious Leningrad Soviet has finally elected the mayor of the city, the head of the city. Let us hope that our system of governmental authority has acquired one more head!

Outlines Program

PM2505112390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 May 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent Yevgeniy Solomenko from Leningrad under "Direct Line" rubric: "New Leningrad City Soviet Chairman"]

[Text] On its 31st day the Leningrad City Soviet finally elected its new chief. Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Sobchak, head of the Economic Law Department at Leningrad University and USSR people's deputy, has become chairman of the soviet.

A news conference was held the same evening. "We are inheriting a city in a very poor if not (in a whole number of departments) catastrophic state," A. Sobchak stated. He spelled out the main guidelines of his action program: the creation of a mixed economy that really works, the acquisition of free economic zone status for Leningrad, the inclusion of the city on the Neva in the Baltic area market, direct ties with other regions, and the earning of funds for self-sufficiency "so we don't have to go begging to the Russian and Union coffers." In the political field the program includes ensuring cooperation among all political forces ready to promote the city's development. In the social sphere it includes protecting the have-nots against the consequences of rising prices, inflation, and the shortage of goods and food products.

Altay Kray Gasoline Supplies Decreasing

LD0406084890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Today, in all towns of the Altay region, ambulances are unable to get to the sick, firemen are unable to respond to alarm calls, and big Ural trucks are at a standstill at construction sites. Half of all the cars in the area are virtually laid up. The reason is that supplies of the most popular brand of gasoline, 93-octane, have dried up throughout the kray. The work force of the Chelyabinsk oil products association, Chelyabinsk Nefteprodukt, has stopped supplying it. In May the quantity dispatched to the Altay was a seventh of what was needed. Not a drop has arrived since the beginning of June. The reason for this situation has not been disclosed. Despite all their requests for information, the people of Altay have not received an answer. As a result, one of the biggest regions of Siberia is being kept on starvation rations as far as gasoline is concerned.

Report on Popular Orthodox Movement Briefing

PM1105173690 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 18, 13-20 May 90 p 6

[Report by Yevgeniy Proshechkin, Chairman of All-Union Anti-Fascist Center" "Generalissimo Stalin's Cause Is in True Hands"]

[Text] A new popular orthodox movement uniting five separate parties and associations has been set up in Moscow, according to a press conference held in late March at a flat near the Metro station Semenovskaya. There are journalists and historians still arguing whether fascism is likely to emerge in Russia or not, but we have to admit that it already exists, after the Moscow press conference. It's another question, though, whether ideas of this kind will receive widespread support.

Here are excerpts from speeches at the press conference.

Aleksandr Kulakov (Orthodox National Patriotic Front Pamyat): "Only unity between the monarch and the people, and not a multitude of parties, can strike a balance between the interests of different nations and social classes.... Only the revival of the orthodox spirit can start the destruction of evil on earth, i.e., Zionism. We believe that the victorious march of the forces of light to free the entire world will start from Russia. Through you, we would like to address all right-minded Europeans with a proposal to consolidate our efforts in the struggle against Zionism: that is Le Pen's National Front, Schoenhuber's Republican Party in West Germany and the Irish Republican Army. We believe that Germany's reunification will prevent Zionism from involving our nations in a third fratricidal war. Moreover, we are convinced that after reunification, the alliance between our two countries will put an end to world evil on our planet, i.e., Zionism. There is already an attempt to establish democracy and capitalism in our country and to weaken executive bodies such as the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the KGB. We see this as Zionist hostilities against our land. With the economy in the Soviet Union badly disorganized it's a crime to come up with the slogan, 'All power to the Soviets!'....Liberalism, humanism, communism and democracy are the weapons with which Judaism is trying to destroy and profane the Aryan world, trying to reduce Aryans to its own level....Secret powers are trying to conquer the the world, they have nurtured Lenin, the abominable vampire, and have found a legal cover-up in the United Nations, which we see as international masonry at the service of Judaism...Generalissimo Stalin was the first to crush the backbone of Lenin's bloody guards and to raise the sword against the bastard cosmopolitan Bolsheviks, that is, the Zionists. Stalin's cause - the cause of struggle against Zionism - goes on to live throughout the world."

Konstantin Smirnov-Ostashvili (Union for National and Proportional Representation Pamyat): "Pamyat is neither a group nor a clan, it's a movement. A guerrilla movement made up of separate detachments and formations.... It's not enough to be concerned only with spiritual revival - it's high time we throw off all the masks, or we will perish once and for all. It's time to act, to throw off the disguises and speak in plain language.... I do not seek power within the Union, and if there is a guy tougher than me, I'm ready to give him the names of all our militants. He can just come and take them."

Konstantin Sidoruk (Russian Popular Party): "Our party is a party of the Russian people. According to official ideology, any person speaking Russian is Russian. But we think differently and we've started research as to who can be considered Russian. There are many criteria: family origins, geographical considerations and so on."

Aleksandr Pobedinskiy (Russian Liberation Union): "We've had enough revolutionary and fundamental changes in our country, enough revoluitons, be they peaceful or violent. All revolutionaries, Social Democrats, Anarchists, Communists and Republicans have been against the Russian people. Perestroyka, like all previous revolutions, runs against the interests of the Russian people. That's why the Russian Liberation Union demands that all revolutionaries should be outlawed. Enough idle talk and attempts to distract people from the priorities of the day. The pseudo intelligentsia is ready to serve any regime or revolution which is alien to the people."

Yevgeniy Pashnin (Christian Patriotic Union): "Perestroyka is being conducted by Zionism, it's alien to the Russian people, it doesn't bring them freedom, prosperity or any other benefit. Perestroika is a noose around the Russian people's neck which they can get rid of only by returning to the church and monarchy, to one strong united power.... We feel that our strength today lies in bringing together all Russian forces. Besides the church and the Army, we should cooperate with right-thinking authorities in the KGB and the Ministry of Internal Affairs in their work to preserve stability within society and the state. We are looking for ways to contact right-minded individuals within the ruling party, which must change its name and revise its programme...."

Novocherkassak Memorial Held for Rally Victims

LD0306102390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2315 GMT 2 Jun 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] [Announcer] Today is the anniversary of the shooting upon the demonstration in Novocherkassk [Rostov Oblast, RSFSR]. It was spoken of in whispers in 1962. More than 20 people were killed and 30 were wounded. Fourteen people were later, in August, brought to trial. Seven of them were sentenced to the highest form of punishment. On the initiative of the city soviet, a rally of mourning was held in the city today. [N. Chebotarev video report shows the city; crowds listening to speakers. Flowers, wreaths, and placards with candles burning in front of them, reading "no one forgotten, nothing forgotten" and "that must never happen again!" are laid on the roads.]

[Chebotarev] Participants in the meeting, among whom were relatives of those who died or who were repressed, adopted an appeal to the government of the country and of Russia demanding an investigation to be carried out into the Novocherkassk tragedy and that secret documents which may throw light upon the events of 2 June 1962 in Novocherkassk be made public.

So far, the following is known. Workers of the electric locomotive construction factory, driven to despair, stopped work. The raising of prices of foodstuffs on 1 June and also another review of the output norms—in actual fact, a lowering of wages—was the reason for the strike. The workers set off in column form for the party gorkom [city party committee]. The leadership of the city and of the oblast, with the participation of [Anastas Ivanovich] Mikoyan [first deputy chairman of USSR Council of Ministers], called out the troops. The demonstrators were met by tanks and armed soldiers. At 1100 rounds of automatic fire resounded around the square in front of the party gorkom. [video shows church service for the dead] Today after the rally there was a civil funeral rite in the local cathedral for those who perished innocently.

Komi ASSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Elected

LD1105165490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0800 GMT on 11 May carries a report on the first session of the Komi ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet.

At the session, USSR People's Deputy Yuriy Alekseyevich Spiridonov, first secretary of the Komi Oblast Party Committee, was elected chairman of the Komi ASSR Supreme Soviet on a contested basis. Spiridonov's main rival was Yuriy Ivanovich Simukov, chairman of the Presidium of the Komi ASSR Supreme Soviet, who won seven votes less in the first round of the elections: As a result he became the first deputy chairman of the Komi ASSR Supreme Soviet.

In an interview Spiridonov explains that he is leaving the oblast committee because now the main use for society, for the population, and even for the party is work in the soviets, which now bear the main burden of resolving all problems, of a possible revolution in the economy.

Simukov is a Komi and Spiridonov is a Russian. Spiridonov points out that today it is necessary to considerably enhance the republic's sovereignty, not only in order to untie "our" hands in deciding the republic's destinies but also to enhance "our" responsibility, to untie "our" hands for the independence of "our" enterprises, organizations, enterprising citizens and for the republic as a whole.

"We must become new and master entirely new approaches in running our territory", he says.

Smolensk Oblast Party Committee Chairman Elected

LD0106221290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] The oblast party conference which ended in Smolensk today held multicandidate elections. As a result, it has elected Viktor Andreyevich Samorodskiy as first chairman of the oblast party Committee. He had previously served as secretary of the oblast party committee for agriculture. The communists defined their attitude toward the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th Party Congress, to the draft statute of the CPSU, and made proposals and remarks on these documents.

The elections of the delegates of the Smolensk Oblast Party Organization to the forthcoming party committee were also held.

First Secretary Reassigned

PM3105132790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 May 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under the general heading: "Plenums Held"]

[Text] Smolensk, 29 May—A Smolensk Oblast CPSU Committee [obkom] plenum was held today to examine an organizational matter.

The plenum agreed to A.A. Vlasenko's request to be relieved of his duties as CPSU obkom first secretary in connection with his transfer to other work.

It was decided to elect the CPSU obkom first secretary at the upcoming oblast party conference.

Galazov Reelected in North Ossetian ASSR

LD1105224990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2000 GMT 11 May 90

[Text] A North Ossetia oblast report-back and election party conference has taken place in Ordzhonikidze. As a result of a secret vote, Galazov chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the North Ossetian ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], has been reelected to the post of the first secretary of the party oblast committee. Likewise delegates to the 28th Party Congress were elected at the conference. Among them is Primakov, member of the USSR Presidential Council, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee.

New Tyumen Oblast, City Leadership Elected

PM1805075690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 May 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Yuriy Perepletkin under "Direct Line" rubric: "Business People In Power"]

[Text] Tyumen—Yu. Shafranik, general director of the "Langepasneftegaz" Association, has been elected

chairman of Tyumen Oblast Soviet in a contested election; and G. Raykov, general director of a machine building association, has been elected chairman of Tyumen City Soviet.

The advent to the leadership of new people, "captains" of industry, has by no means excluded an element of continuity. At its first session, which has just ended, Tyumen Oblast Soviet elected as chairman of the ispolkom [executive committee] L. Roketskiy, a soviet worker of long standing who was previously head of Surgut City ispolkom.

The session took place with a high degree of activity among the deputies. Sometimes it went over the top.

For example, the Tyumen deputies gradually grouped into distinctive factions, dividing in particular into the "industrial north" and the "agricultural south." There was a moment when the agrarians expressed their protest by walking out of the hall en masse. The absence of several dozen people paralyzed the session for a time.

The deputies adopted a decision to publish their own, soviet oblast newspaper. They did not manage to elect an editor: None of the three candidates secured the required number of votes. The resolution of this important question together with a whole series of others has been carried over to the second session.

Svekolkin Reelected Magadan Oblast Secretary

PM0106144990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Party Conference"]

[Text] Magadan, 31 May—On the third day of the oblast party conference being held here, elections were held for CPSU obkom [oblast committee] secretaries. There will now be five of them, as before, rather than three. That is the decision reached by the oblast's communists. Out of the five candidates on the list, V.V. Svekolkin was reelected first secretary of Magadan CPSU Obkom by direct secret ballot.

Buryat Party Organization Conference Held

LD0106212590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] A conference of the Buryat Oblast Party Organization was held in Ulan-Ude on 1 June. Its participants discussed a draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th Party Congress and rules of the CPSU, and confirmed the delegates to the party congress.

Astrakhan Party Conference Held; Dyakov Reelected

LD0306162790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 3 Jun 90

[Text] A TASS Astrakhan correspondent reports that today an oblast report-back and election party conference ended here. A report-back of the oblast CPSU committee, positions of Astrakhan communists for the forthcoming CPSU Congress [sentence indistinct] and the question of creating the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party. By a secret vote, Dyakov was re-elected first secretary of Astrakhan CPSU Oblast Committee.

Four Oblasts Replace Party First Secretaries

LD0206195290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 2 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In Ivanovo, Kurgan, Sverdlovsk, and Cheboksary; party conferences have completed their work today. Organizational matters were examined at the conference. Comrades Tikhomirov, Plekhanov, Kadochnikov, and Shurchanov were elected first secretaries of the CPSU oblast committee.

Western Republics

Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Debates Chairmanship

PM0206193190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by unidentifed own correspondent under the general heading "At the Sessions of Supreme Soviets"]

[Text] Kiev, 1 Jun—People's deputies have been discussing candidacies for the post of chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet for two days now. Dmitro Pavlychko and Vyacheslav Chernovil have stood down from the contest for the post. Debates have been stormy, particularly yesterday, when discussion as to whether the first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee could simultaneously be chairman of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet was thrust upon deputies.

At one time the hall was seized by the headiness of a rally. Many deputies, particularly communists, continually sought by means of restraint, clear-cut positions, and cogent arguments to prevent the confrontation that was ready to break out.

The discussion of candidates ended at this evening's sitting of the session. Another four contestants withdrew during the debate. Thus, the tellers' commission has been handed a list to be put to the vote which includes V. Grinev, V. Ivashko, I. Saliy, and I. Yukhnovskiy. It has been resolved to hold the elections Monday.

Candidate for Chairmanship Interviewed

LD0106192290 Kiev International Service in English 2300 GMT 31 May 90

[Interview with candidate for chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Levko Lukyanenko by unidentified correspondent, place and date not given—read by announcer, recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] And at the end of our tonight's edition of Ukraine Today we bring you a political portrait of one of the candidates for the post of the chairman of the Ukraine's Supreme Soviet, Levko Lukyanenko. He was born in 1927. He is a Ukrainian, a graduate of the Moscow State University, where he studied for a lawyer. He is the chairman of the Republican Party of the Ukraine. He lives in the village of Koty in Kiev region. He was elected people's deputy of the Ukraine in Ivano-Frankivsk Region. He spent 27 years of his life in prison. Here is an interview Radio Kiev's reporter had with Levko Lukyanenko:

You are the leader of the recently set up Ukrainian Republican Party and run for the post of the chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet. So what do you think about the joining of the party and state posts, asks our correspondent.

[Lukyanenko in Ukrainian with superimposed English report] I consider that under the present-day conditions such joining of the positions is very dangerous. We just make our first steps toward democracy and the decision to combine the post of the first secretary of the party and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet can bring us back to the dictatorship. This why personally I and the entire Republican Party comes out against the joining of the two most important posts in one person.

[Announcer] You are the former political prisoner, who spent 27 years in jail. Now you are the deputy to the Ukraine's Supreme Soviet. Is this due to the democratization of our society, or an exception from the rule?

[Lukyanenko] The fact that perestroyka has got under way is historically inevitable. But the fact that I happened to become people's deputy to the Supreme Soviet is to a certain extent thanks to a lucky star.

[Announcer] And do you believe in perestroyka?

[Lukyanenko] I believe in the inevitability of expansion of the human rights throughout the world, and I believe in the inevitability of technical progress. These two factors lead to the third factor, that is the inevitability of the collapse of the Russian Empire, and formation of independent states on its ruins. Ukraine as a Union republic must be among the first republics to ensure its true independence and secede from the USSR.

[Announcer] And how do you imagine the near future of the Ukraine?

[Lukyanenko] The near future of the Ukraine will be complicated and difficult. We are to restructure the economy in which now man is just a robot controlled by the administration by mere injunction system. [sentence as heard] We must make it so that any worker should have the right to open his own enterprises and show his initiative to full extent. The living standards of the population during this transitional period will decline, said Levko Lukyanenko.

[Announcer] Unlike Levko Lukyanenko, I am more optimistic as far as the future of the Ukraine is concerned. If all the political forces in our Parliament manage to consolidate their efforts, and direct them towards the solution of the most important problems in cooperation with the entire people of the Ukraine, the situation will become much better.

Chairman Candidates View Leadership Roles

LD0106175690 Kiev International Service in English 2300 GMT 31 May 90

[Passages in quotation marks are recorded in Ukrainian with superimposed English translation throughout]

[Excerpt] As we have already informed you, these days the people's deputies of the Ukraine are solving undoubtedly one of the most important questions of the session: They elect the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. First, 13 candidatures were nominated for this post. During the last two days, 10 contenders made their program speeches. After Dmytro Pavlychko stated today in the morning about his decision to withdraw his candidature from the list of contenders for the post of the Supreme Soviet chairman, nine contenders remained, and according to the regulations, discussion of these candidatures had to begin today at the morning sitting. But the session slowed down again. Upon the initiative of several deputies, representatives of the democratic bloc began an acute discussion concerning the problem of combining the post of a party leader and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. We have carried out a brief questionnaire in order to learn what deputies think about this. Says Dmytro Pavlychko:

[Pavlychko] "We would like all the people know who of the people's deputies stands for combining of these two positions, and who is against. Moreover, we know that many people don't support the idea of combining of the posts. However, the result is to be lack of courage, I think, because all of them in their pre-election platforms promised to the people to fight against it. They said that they were fed up with the cult that the Supreme Soviet would be headed exclusively by a person who is busy with the state activity and at the same time this person cannot combine his post of chairman with another leading post in any party. This concerns not only, say, Vladimir Ivasho, but Levko Lukyanenko too."

[Announcer] And here is how Yakiv Zayko, people's deputy from the city of Zhitomir, views this question:

[Zayko] "I had a meeting with my voters in Zhitomir city literally on May the 16th, and about 5,000 people

gathered there at the meeting, and we discussed the same question. Is it advisable to combine two such responsible posts or not? And there a decision was taken that the chairman would be a nonparty man."

[Announcer] Andriy Sukhorukov, a deputy from Kharkiv region:

[Sukorukov] "My voters ordered me not to maintain this proposition. If we elect Levko Lukyanenko the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, he will retire from the post of the leader of the Republican Party, though it is a new party. And this is to be done, I guess, by Vladimir Ivashko, too."

[Announcer] Nevertheless, the majority of people's deputies with whom we talked take this problem without much worry, as they think that both posts can be held at one and the same time. In the meanwhile, the members of parliament continued their debate over the candidates to the post of the Supreme Soviet chairman. Different views were expressed, which ranged from sheer compliments to bitter attacks on the contenders and their political groups. [passage omitted]

Report on Nominations for Chairmanship

LD2905110190 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 28 May 90

[Text] Today the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet session moved to the next question on the agenda—election of chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Ukraine. Among the candidates advanced for the post are Dmytro Pavlychko, Volodymyr Ivashko, Ihor Yukhnovskyy, Levko Lukyanenko, Mykhaylo Horyn, Volodymyr Yavorivskyy, Volodymyr Hryniv, Vyacheslav Chornovil, Ivan Saliy, Ivan Drach, and Vitaliy Karpenko.

Tomorrow, the deputies will start discussing these candidatures.

Ukraine's Ivashko Remarks on Elections

LD0406051190 Kiev International Service in English 2300 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] When the evening sitting started, the candidates for the post of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet began withdrawing their candidatures. Deputies Ivan Drach, Mikhaylo Horyn, as well as Vyacheslav Chornovil, explained these actions as their protests against combining positions. However, the deputies kept discussing programs of these candidates who continue to run for the highest state position in the republic.

Vladimir Ivashko is one of them. Having used his chance, our colleague interviewed him. The question was whom of the contenders Vladimir Ivashko would invite to be his deputy in case Ivashko is elected as chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine. He said:

[Begin Ivashko recording in Ukrainian with superimposed English translation] I don't think this is a question I would answer now, because first of all I'm not yet elected and no one knows whether they will elect me or not. Secondly, I'm never against anyone personally. I stand for my own position. Any person who will vote will decide himself whom he will take as a deputy chairman, said Vladimir Ivashko. [end recording]

By five p.m. there were only four candidates left. Deputies Mikhaylo Horyn, Ivan Drach, Vladimir Yavorivskyy also crossed out their candidatures. So the deputies had to choose among Vladimir Ivashko from Kiev, Ivan Saliy from Kiev, Ihor Yukhnovskyy, also from Kiev and (Vladimir Hrynev) from Kharkov. Their names were put to the voting bulletins. On Monday the session will continue its work.

Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Deputies on Session

LD0306230590 Kiev International Service in English 2300 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The first session of the Ukrainian parliament is going on in the capital city of the Ukraine. This day the deputies continued to discuss the candidatures of pretenders [candidates] to the post of the chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. This morning one of the pretenders, Vyacheslav Chornovil, people's deputy of the republic from Lvov, took his candidature off. When speaking at the session, he in particular said that the only reason of this was the political mistake of the deputies. The deputies gave their consent to holding of more than one office. The matter is that the chairman of the Supreme Soviet will be able to be the leader of any party. In our previous programs, we already told you that as a result of the voting, most of the deputies have given their consent for holding of more than one office, and didn't consider this to be a political mistake. So what criteria are important for the deputies when discussing the candidatures? [passage omitted]

Volodymyr Yavorivskyy, a well-known writer and public figure, one of the candidates, said in particular the following:

[Begin Yavorivskyy recording in Ukrainian, with superimposed English translation] Knowing all the deputies, I was sure that a stereotype will work during our session, and this stereotype causes no doubts among the deputies. But in any case we've written a new page in the history of our Ukrainian parliament, and many errors were directed to our main candidature, Volodymyr Ivashko, and this is very important. But everybody does understand that Volodymyr Ivashko will be elected. That is why I take my candidature off. From the very beginning I knew that it was unperspective to put my candidature forward, but I used the tribune of our session to speak about my program, to propose some ways of solving some problems; that is, I did fulfil the mission given me by the Democratic Bloc of the deputies, said Volodymyr Yavorivskyy. [end recording]

Ukrainian Deputy Criticizes Moscow, Party

LD0106213390 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 31 May 90

["Supreme Soviet Diary" program]

[Excerpts] Today, deputies continued to discuss the virtues of the candidates for the post of chairman of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet. [passage omitted] The floor was given to Oleksandr Hudyma, deputy from Lutsk, who works as a lecturer:

[Begin Hudyma recording] Recently in Lutsk alone a new building for the oblast executive committee costing R12 million was built while the line for housing has grown to 26,000. The building of the oblast KGB has been enlarged at a cost of R5 million. All-Union ministries squeeze R350 million from Lutsk while the city's budget is R6 million in the red.

Then, take the city's enterprises, such as the Polymer works, the plastic goods factory, and others where workshops of death are operating and where workers are paid miserable wages. For this remuneration, and without any external protection they have to pack poisonous substances. All of this is being done with the assistance of both the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Ukraine and the local party body.

Volynian Oblast is one of the long suffering oblasts. The previous speaker tried to assure us that Comrade Ivashko possesses strategic thinking and that he is farsighted. Let me to disagree: He will not be able to see further than Moscow! Let us be brave, let us untie those party fetters, let us become free at last! The people are behind you! The people have elected you to improve their lot!

As for myself, I am going to vote for Levko Lukyanenko because his biography and his destiny is the destiny of the Ukraine. [end recording]

Report on Compromises in Ukrainian Parliament

90UN1925A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 May 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Article by S. Tsikora, Kiev: "The Deputies Find a Compromise"]

[Text] **Two antagonistic factions in the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet are now satisfied.**

The deputies of the bloc consisting of party officials and administrators were happy: The blue and yellow flags—the national symbols unapproved so far—that annoyed them for several days disappeared from the session hall. Deputies from the other bloc—mostly the representatives of new public organizations—were just as happy because they did not allow the installation of the current state flag of the Ukrainian SSR in the hall. Both factions agreed that one state symbol, the flag above the dome of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet building, was sufficient.

Because of that agreement the session could continue after the crisis during which some of the oblast deputies had left the hall. They claimed they were being "pressured" and their rights were curtailed. A compromise in such a delicate matter as this makes one hopeful that the deputies will find ways in the future also to resolve the complex issues that are being discussed at the session.

There are 27 such issues on the agenda. It took the deputies four days to discuss and approve them. During these days two approaches to the discussion became clearly outlined. According to the opinion of one group of the delegates, the agenda should start with the selection of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet chairman and he then would help to form the remaining power organs. The other group think that first the deputies should deal with the political, socioeconomic, and ecological situation in the Ukraine and only after that should they nominate the people capable of leading the republic out of its deep crisis.

Understandably, with views like that it is impossible to do without debates. We just hope that a compromise will be found as already happened on Tuesday.

Ukraine Adopts Resolution on Economic Plan

LD2905142290 Moscow TASS in English 1103 GMT 29 May 90

[By TASS correspondent Anatoliy Grigoryev]

[Text] Kiev May 29 TASS—The Ukrainian parliament adopted on Monday a resolution on the Soviet Government's plan for a transition to a regulated market economy and a rise in state retail prices.

A transition to regulated market economy is an objective and natural process, but it is inadmissible to increase state retail prices without a reliable compensation mechanism and without consultations with Union republics.

The resolution was adopted at the session after the report on political, social, economic and ecological situation in the Ukraine, made by the republic's prime minister, Vitaliy Masol.

The Ukrainian Council of Ministers is instructed to prepare a package of bills and normative acts to regulate conditions and the order of the republic's transition to a regulated market economy. It is also to ensure social protection for its citizens and submit it for consideration of the next session of the republic's parliament.

Deputies nominated over ten candidates for the chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet. They are to be discussed today.

Views Market Transition

PM0106141190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 May 90 p 1

[Unattributed untitled report]

[Text] The Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has expressed its attitude toward the transition to a market economy. It says specifically in a resolution: "The adoption of any decisions on questions of raising state wholesale prices without a reliable compensatory mechanism for the social protection of the population and without the Union republics' consent is deemed inadmissible."

Report on Ukrainian Suprme Soviet Proceedings

PM2305145590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 May 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondents M. Odinets and I. Tikhomirov: "More Excesses..."]

[Text] Kiev, 22 May—To be sure, every day of the session provides an instance of excessive behavior bordering on the scandalous. Today was no exception, unfortunately. The reason was the discussion of articles connected with the election of the chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet. With each passing minute the atmosphere in the auditorium became less and less that of a parliamentary session.

The "democratic minority" is trying its level best to compensate for the lack of votes for the decisions it wants to get through by means of sound effects, by opting for obstuctionist tactics.... Hence the apparently unexpected incidents, no doubt.

During a break in the sitting we met with V.A. Ivashko, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee and USSR people's deputy. Dwelling on the fact that the recent Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum decided to make him the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee's recommended candidate for the post of Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet chairman, although at its session yesterday and today there were statements by a number of deputies to the effect that the posts cannot be combined, V.A. Ivashko said:

"Of course, in the current situation, it would be extremely arduous to combine such posts, but one must also appreciate the situation in the party. What would my resignation from the party post in conditions of constant attacks on the CPSU look like? Betrayal? But I cannot betray the party I deliberately joined, the party I believe in. So if the deputies elect me head of the Supreme Soviet, let the congress decide the matter.

Ukrainian Leader Urges Caution on Market Economy

LD0206110490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Choices are always hard to make, even when they concern seemingly obvious things on a domestic level. And the process almost always becomes difficult and sensitive when you're talking about the election of new leaders wielding power on behalf of the people, especially when they are replacing all the old leaders. After all, when we choose somebody as a leader, we are also choosing a new course. It is obvious that those who do not achieve success have to leave the stage and give other people a chance to have a go. So, here is a report about another election, taking place at the session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet: [video shows interior of debating chamber, with deputies seated in rows, closing in on individuals]

[Correspondent V. Lyaskalo, identified by caption] The deputies have been at work for two weeks now. Yet only three days ago did they get around to discussing one of the main points on the agenda, the election of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. The candidates nominated for this important position were discussed today. After a number of candidates withdrew, eight contestants remained by the time the evening session started. [video shows close-up of a woman deputy on the rostrum. Electronic indicator, flashing messages in Ukrainian, shows that the speaker is from Lvov Oblast. View of another speaker] [passage omitted] The deputies also adopted a number of decisions on urgent matters. One of them is addressed to the USSR Supreme Soviet. It deals with the outline proposals submitted by the USSR Government for a transition to a regulated market economy. [video cuts to show correspondent interviewing a man identified in a caption as "V.A Masol, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian SSR"]

So, Vitaliy Andreyevich, as far as I can tell, the mass media are treating the decision on this question which you adopted at the session, as a kind of economic ultimatum, so to speak, to the central government. How do you see this?

[Masol] I do not regard it as an ultimatum. We came out against a hasty and unprepared transition to a market economy. The market economy is a system, and a system must have, first and foremost, its laws—laws on taxation, credit, and so on. Therefore, we felt that the laws, the taxation system, the system of tarriffs—the entire gamut of documents—should be prepared first. Subsequently, we can go over to a market economy.

Report on Ivashko Tour of Dnepropetrovsk

90UN1920A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 8 May 90 p 1

[Unattributed article: "Meeting the Villagers"]

[Text] On 4 and 5 May the first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, V.A. Ivashko, visited the Solonyanskiy, Tomakovskiy, and Nikopolskiy Rayons of the Dnepropetrovsk Oblast.

There he met with kolkhoz [collective farm] farmers, experts in agriculture, secretaries of the primary and shop party organizations, and other electoral officials. They discussed the political and economic reforms,

talked about their preparations for the CPSU 28th Congress and for the 28th Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party. They paid special attention to the problems of the party revival and to strengthening the solidarity of the party ranks. It was also emphasized that the central task of party work is still to design and to organize the implementation of an up-to-date economic policy.

In the course of the exchange of interests and opinions they discussed their top priorities—the introduction of progressive economic forms in agriculture and the social development of the rural areas. They mentioned the need to use the republic's industrial potential more actively; they talked about the possibility of setting up industrial centers to strengthen the production base especially where it concerns the processing and storage of the agricultural produce. They discussed the construction of residential buildings and roads, and water and gas supplies for the villages.

Ukrainian Farmers Demand Recall of Deputies

90UN1846A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 12 May 90 p 1

[Report by SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent V. Zakrevskiy: "Picketing in the Field"]

[Text] Dnepropetrovsk Oblast—A sunny, blossoming day. Young and old alike are drawn to the line of buses. Even the machine operators of the Kolkhoz [collective farm] imeni Gorky, Nikopolskiy Rayon, have left the sowing for a couple of hours in order to take part in the protest rally in the deep abyss of the Pokrovskiy pit. Like a monster from heaven knows where, it is stealing closer and closer to their native village, ready to swallow it.

The destruction of the lands of Dnepropetrovsk Oblast's leading farm was planned during the years of stagnation. It was then that no one conferred with farmers; everything was decided in departmental offices. This is where the idea ripened to "reduce" the rich village, squeezing its population into several high-rise boxes. That is why the alarm caused by the invasion of the Ordzhonikidze mining-enrichment combine is completely understandable. Our newspaper has written about this on more than one occasion, but the high offices are still silent, and the miners persistently manage their affair. The ecological brigandage is being conducted under the raucous slogan, "The country needs manganese!" Who would argue that? But at what cost?

The speech at the rally by Kolkhoz Chairman, Hero of Socialist Labor N. Galayda was permeated with alarm over the fate of the farm. He is indignant at the deafness of the leaders who have undertaken this unseemly action in the name of departmental interests.

"We have always taught the children to love and protect the land, the land of their ancestors," said retired teacher G. Shevchenko. "And what do we actually see? The pits are gobbling up the land. Not only the land; they are destroying our future as well."

We must rise up all together for the defense of our fields, the rally participants resolved. They demanded that the Pokrovsky pit be closed immediately.

One of the rally's resolutions notes that the USSR people's deputies G. Lezhenko and V. Zadyrko have regarded the villagers' tragedy without due attention. They did not react to the letter from 12,000 Nikopol grain farmers who asked that they take emergency measures. The rally participants forwarded a stiff demand: to raise the issue of recalling these deputies. It was also resolved that if the further destruction of land is not halted, guard pickets will be posted around the pit.

How far do people have to be pushed before they decide to take extreme measures!

Ukrainian Democratic Party Issues Manifesto

LD0106175290 Kiev International Service in English 2300 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] A manifesto of the Democratic Party of the Ukraine has been announced today. Head of the preparatory committee of the constituent congress of the Democratic Party of the Ukraine, Dmytro Pavlychko, said in his interview for Radio Kiev that the formation of a multiparty system and democratic society is the nationwide task, and this is why no effort should be spared so as to build multiparty structures.

I consider, continued Dmytro Pavlychko, that ours will be the party of national revival and national justice in relation to the native population of the Ukraine and all nations living in its territory. It is clear from the document which we have announced. It was signed by 88 people, among them people's deputies of the Soviet Union, people's deputies of the Ukraine, prominent scientists, workers, writers, and numerous representatives of the intelligentsia. We put forward concrete economic and ecological programs, and also the program of social insurance. But I would like to emphasize that the main force of the Democratic Party will be intellectuals.

We hope that the membership of the party will significantly grow by the time it will hold its constituent congress in autumn this year, said Dmytro Pavlychko, the activist of the Democratic Party of the Ukraine.

Belorussian Supreme Soviet Views Market Reform

LD0106164790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] A session of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet passed a decision on its attitude to the USSR Government's concept of the transition to a regulated market economy. It expresses support for the government's desire to seek ways of improving the life of the Soviet people in a single socialist society. However, says the

decision, in view of the worsening of the situation in the republic's consumer market due to the sharp increase in demand caused by discussion in the USSR Supreme Soviet of the concept of the transition to a regulated market economy as proposed by the USSR Council of Ministers and the expected increase in retail prices, the People's Deputies of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic are seriously concerned about a possible lowering of the standard of living of the workers, and especially of the worst-off groups of the population. For this reason, the republican Supreme Soviet considers it intolerable that any decisions should be made to raise state retail prices without a guarantee of appropriate compensation by social protection of the population and without nationwide discussion of these problems. The Belorussian Council of Minister is instructed to prepare and submit to a routine session of the USSR Supreme Soviet a program for the transition of the republics to a regulated market economy, including a package of bills and normative enactments providing reliable social protection for the population on the internal market.

Moldvia Requests Return of Armenian Aid

LD0106123990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 1 Jun 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Some reports from Moldavia: The Council of Ministers of the republic has decided to ask the USSR Government to return R50,000,000 of the funds the republic granted in aid to Armenia after the 1988 quake.

The number of those who suffered from the earthquake in Moldavia now amounts to 595 persons.

The parliament of Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic has adopted a decision to create a Ministry of National Security.

Caucasus

Armenia's Movsisyan Claims 'Crisis of Power'

PM3105165990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Sergey Bablumyan report: "Unanswered Questions"]

[Text] Yerevan—Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Internal Affairs Ministry reports continue to cause alarm. In the last 24 hours, 24 crimes have been recorded in the republic, 13 of them in Yerevan.

But what does cause serious concern is the fact that people are, alas, beginning to get used to the daily reports of tragic events. Just as they are to the law-enforcement organs' unfulfilled promises to determine those really to blame for the lawlessness and bring them to book. Vague phrases like "certain sources" and rhetorical questions like "who benefits from this?" no longer suit anyone. Moreover, they rebound on those who actively resort to such phrases, to wit, the official organs of power.

Answering an ARMENPRES correspondent's questions, V. Movsisyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, said, among other things: "What we have here now is a crisis of power: Many executive and law-enforcement organs are inactive. Exploiting this, some forces are trying to channel the wave of discontent into antistate and even antinational provocations. The lawlessness of the last two months and the tragic events of 27 May are evidence of this."

I will take the liberty of observing that acknowledging the crisis of power is only half the task. The other and major part of the task is to actually overcome the protracted crisis. How long will we still have to wait?

Official Comments on 'Tense Situation' in Yerevan

LD0106165890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1541 GMT 1 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Boris Sopelnyak]

[Text] Yerevan, 1 June (TASS)—A tense situation has developed around the military units that are stationed in Armenian territory. This was announced by Major-General Mikhail Surkov, chief of the Political Department of Yerevan Garrison and USSR people's deputy.

Today, at a press conference that was held in the capital of the republic, he said that attacks on posts, attempts to disarm guards, and the firing on of patrols have become normal phenomenon. In the last few days, 48 cases of attacks on the soldiers of the Soviet Army with the object of seizing weapons have been registered. Unfortunately, many of them were successful. According to the military data, altogether 2,724 small arms have been stolen and seized, including 1,012 machineguns, assault-rifles, and pistols; the rest being sporting arms and hunting and training weapons.

Threats are being made more and more frequently against members of the families of officers and warrant officers by all sorts of aggressive groups which, unfortunately, influences public opinion.

Having noted that in the republic there are many armed people who openly stroll about the streets of towns and villages, the general reported that on the night of 29-30 May the military quarters were fired upon by automatic weapons. One soldier was wounded.

Mikhail Surkov stated that the leaders of the Armenian national movement, the Armenian national army, and other groups often are not in control of the situation; weapons have fallen into the hands of criminals.

Having stressed the undesirability of introducing a state of emergency and of removing weapons by force, Mikhail Surkov called upon the armed formations to give up their weapons voluntarily. This will further, to a decisive extent, the restoration of peace in the territory of Armenia, the general stressed.

Union Official Interviewed on Yerevan Situation

LD0106214190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 1 June broadcasts a seven-minute report by special correspondent Sergey Fanton from Yerevan, where "on 27 May a military unit was attacked." Correspondent Fanton interviews Major-General Nechayev, deputy head of the political directorate of the Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, who says: "I have to say that the situation in the city remains difficult and potentially explosive. I have the impression that there are those who badly want the heat of emotions aroused by recent events to be kept up. All kinds of rumors, for example, are circulating in the city, which are whipping up the situation and creating additional tension. There is talk of some plot by the center; of alleged provocations by the military. And the result is—and this is natural—that the population are beginning to fear for their lives and for the lives of their loved ones and their children."

Nechayev goes on to read from a document "prepared for circulation" by the Armenian Committee of the Karabakh Movement and the Armenian National Movement, entitled "Criminal Provocation by Moscow." It says a clash took place between a military patrol and an "unknown group," in which six citizens were killed and 10 soldiers wounded. The group, he says, was not unknown: on the contrary, the names of the "bandits" are well known. Nechayev denies that the military fired indiscriminately. Armored vehicles did not drive through the central streets of Yerevan looking for trouble, as claimed, but were taking wounded soldiers to the hospital, he says. The document, he continues, "turns everything upside down, and deliberately omits many facts" —such as that the military "have recently been subjected to armed attack more than 50 times."

Nechayev concludes by asking: "Who needs the inflaming of anti-Army passions? Not the Army, and not the Armenian people. Who, then? The answer, in my view, has been given loud and clear by the authors of the document I have in my hand."

Union Deputy Discusses Armenian Incidents

PM0106154490 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Jun 90 First Edition p 1

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy Major General M. Surkov by our correspondent Lieutenant Colonel O. Falichev, place, date of interview not stated: "How To Cut the Knot"—first paragraph is KRASNAYA ZVEZDA introduction]

[Text] Our correspondent asked USSR People's Deputy Major General M. Surkov for his opinion on the tragic events in Yerevan.

[Falichev] Mikhail Semenovich, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has already reported what happened, but readers are asking: How could such a thing happen? Can you answer this question, not only as an eyewitness of those stormy events, but also as USSR people's deputy from Leninakanskiy-Shirakskiy National Territorial Electoral District?

[Surkov] I would like first of all to speak about what happened. In the morning of 27 May at 0550 there was an attack on a sentry in the region of the settlement of Artashat. The attack was absolutely vile, from behind, with a weapon. The sentry, Private Arkhipkin, suffered a serious gunshot wound. At 0850 there was an exchange of fire at the railroad station between internal troops servicemen and attacking terrorists. In the course of this, 10 servicemen were wounded, including officer Tereshchenko. By 1700 hours the militants, furious by now, moved into the region where an internal troops regiment is stationed. Our units are alongside it. The attackers, blocking the road, started to fire on the military camp from the commanding heights. Our servicemen were setting off to Yerevan on garrison patrol at that very moment. The detail was fired on, Pvt. Ayvazyan was wounded, and a vehicle containing Senior Warrant Officer Arutyunyan and Sergeants Korolev and Komkov was seized. We decided to clear the road block and get our people back, but as soon as the reserve group headed by Lieutenant Colonel V. Arakshev set off, it came under fire from all sides. Meanwhile the MVD [Internal Affairs Ministry] unit was engaged in what can without exaggeration be called a real battle.... All the same, we managed to get our people out.

[Falichev] What kind of weapons were the attackers using?

[Surkov] First, there were not 50 of them, as Central Television reported, but approximately 300-350, and they were armed, as was confirmed at the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, with submachineguns, machineguns, grenade throwers, and grenades. They were not only shooting at me, but also at Ashot Manucharyan, a member of the Armenian Pannational Movement board, who was with me. I managed to give the cease-fire order over the radio. At the same time representatives of the Armenian Pannational Movement board were conducting talks with the attackers. But that proved difficult.... Then Rafail Kazaryan, deputy chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, and Artashes Gegamyan, chairman of Yerevan City Soviet, arrived. It was only after two hours of joint efforts that we managed to stop the bloodshed. Unfortunately there were totally unjustified casualties on both sides.

[Falichev] Why do you think these events occurred?

[Surkov] One reason, I think, is that the USSR Supreme Soviet March resolution, which talked about the deterioration in the situation in the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the Armenian SSR and the confiscation of weapons, was not fulfilled, although it named the specific bodies that were instructed to carry out the confiscation. After this resolution the attitude to

the Soviet Army began to deteriorate, rather than improve. We have had numerous instances of attacks on guards, sentries, and military vehicles. It is surprising that the mass media, especially Central Television and the central press, keep quiet about these instances. Yet today there are weapons not only in the hands of those who are guarding the Armenian border, but also in the hands of criminals and gangsters. The terrorist detachments also include people who are simply uncontrollable, as their leaders have often told me. And lastly, the people do not know the true state of affairs. Either in the country as a whole or in the republic. When these detachments were set up to defend the border, everyone supported it, but now no one takes the responsibility for organizing the attack.... The lack of accountability and the ineffectiveness of the law are also reasons for what happened.

[Falichev] You were acting in a complex situation without orders or instructions. Were there any recommendations or advice from the republic Central Committee?

[Surkov] When it happened, the only person with whom I managed to discuss things before leaving for the scene of the fighting was Colonel General Yuriy Vasilyevich Shatalin—commander of the USSR MVD Internal Troops.

Later, after the situation was quelled, I had a conversation at the scene, by telephone, with V. Movsisyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee. He requested that further conflict be prevented. The assistant first secretary arrived along with Rafail Kazaryan. I think all this helped to coordinate efforts to some extent.

[Falichev] What part did Gdlyan and Ivanov play (they have been written about) in smoothing over this conflict?

[Surkov] They went to the garrison command headquarters, the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, and the headquarters of informal organizations. They did not go to the actual places where hostilities were in progress.

[Falichev] What is the reaction of the servicemen themselves to what happened?

[Surkov] We were forced to assemble people and explain that they must not yield to provocation under any circumstances and that the attackers must not be identified with the Armenian people. Although this work was not at all easy: Servicemen have already been subjected to so many sneaky attacks, they have been robbed, hostages have even been taken. Threats against servicemen have become more frequent. A great many illustrations could be cited to confirm all this. And of course, people's moods are very complex today. But it would be nice to believe that the Armenian people still have a good attitude toward the military and the Soviet Army.

[Falichev] What military groupings did the attackers belong to?

[Surkov] I think representatives of several groupings went into action. The prosecutor's office is conducting an investigation.

[Falichev] What, in your view, must be done to stabilize the situation in the republic?

[Surkov] The first path is the path of political resolution of the questions. The voluntary fulfillment of the decision to hand over weapons is necessary, as well as, of course, a further study of questions connected with the Nagorno-Karabakh problem. Unfortunately some of the decisions adopted earlier did not serve the cause of normalization. If a voluntary surrender of weapons does not take place, I think our leadership, and perhaps first and foremost the local leadership, must adopt the most resolute measures, up to and including the imposition of a state of emergency. This path is a long way from democracy, but we must remember that people's lives are at stake.

Moscow TV Reports Situation in Yerevan 'Calm'

LD0206110390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] What is life like in Armenia following the events of 27 May? Here is a report by our special correspondent. [video shows correspondent Aleksandr Barkhatov in a tree-lined avenue, addressing the camera; view of customers seated at a sidewalk cafe; fountains; schoolgirls; flags and party symbols outside central buildings]

[Barkhatov] The tension apparent at the end of May, caused as we know, by the bloody incidents at the Yerevan railway station and in the suburb of Sovetashen, is not affecting the outward appearance of Yerevan, at least not now. On the surface, life in the city is calm. Industrial enterprises and various services in the city are working. High school students are taking their exams. Maybe one of the reasons for this calm atmosphere is the agreement reached between representatives of the Armenian nationalist movement and the commanders of army detachments, detachments of internal troops. They have agreed that weapons should be as inconspicuous as possible within the city and that there should no displays of strength on either side.

In Yerevan there are now over 80 unofficial organizations, including ones which claim the status of parties. They also have their headquarters in the city center. Some have de facto legal, armed formations, created, as has often been declared, to keep order in areas of the republic close to the border. [passage omitted] [video shows large crowd being addressed by speaker]

Armenian Central Committee on 27 May Incident

LD0206140290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1147 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] Yerevan, 2 June (TASS)—A report is published in the local newspaper KOMMUNIST today on a session of the Communist Party of Armenia Central Committee Bureau. It examines the tragic incidents which occurred in Yerevan on 27 May and urgent measures to stabilize the sitaution in the republic.

The Central Committee Bureau assessed the tragic incidents which occurred as a gross provocation aimed at destabilizing the situation in the republic further, stirring up anti-Army sentiments, and putting the Armenian people in confrontation with subunits of the Soviet Army and internal troops.

It was noted that what occurred was a consequence of the criminal irresponsibility of individual groups and persons and their instigative activities, which led to bloodshed. This was also encouraged by the passive, irresolute, and at times, unprincipled actions of the republic's law enforcement bodies in ensuring public order, stopping numerous instances of seizures of arms and confiscating them from various groups, including those of an obviously criminal nature.

It was noted further that the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers is elaborating measures to confiscate arms, ammunition, explosive substances, and motor vehicles which have been seized and are being illegally held by criminal groups and persons. The need to continue work to ensure the voluntary return of seized arms and vehicles was stressed. Otherwise, measures will be taken by the law enforcement bodies, in accordance with the law, to confiscate arms, ammunition, and means of transport which have been seized and obtained illegally.

The Armenia Communist Party Central Committee Bureau appealed again to the working people of the republic to maintain calm and self-control, not to yield to provocations, and to encourage the return of peace and quiet to our home.

An identical appeal was heard at a 60,000-strong rally held in Theater Square in Yerevan on Friday. The majority of those present received with approval a call concerning the need to treat servicemen's families with respect.

The situation in the capital of Armenia remains tense. For instance, the Yerevan garrison hospital was fired on the night of 1 to 2 June. An attack was made on a motor vehicle of the border troops in Oktemberyanskiy Rayon, in which the vehicle and two submachineguns with their ammunition were seized. A military checkpoint on a road in Megri Rayon was subjected to an identical attack. Two submachineguns were seized.

'Apathy' Forces Repeat Elections in Armenia

LD0206160290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] The Central Electoral Commission of Armenia has announced the results of elections to the republic's Supreme Soviet. The names of the first finalists in the electoral marathon wil be entered on just 99 of the 259 deputy's cards. A republican parliament able to start carrying out its duties will be formed only after repeat elections and repeat balloting. However, it is possible that they too will become just another stage in the election campaign.

Such a turn of events cannot be called unexpected. One of the main reasons for the situation that has arisen is the refusal of a significant part of the population to take part in the election campaign. The voters' apathy is generated by the instability of the political situation in the repubic—the multiple authority that is taking shape in it, which is turning into powerlessness more obviously the further it goes, with all the attendant consequences.

Repeat balloting will take place tomorrow, the repeat elections will be held within the next two months.

Armenian Deputy Says Freedom Fight To Continue

LD0306034890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2315 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Report by A. Barkhatov]

[Text] [Video shows Armenian deputy on the steps of a plane addressing a cheering crowd and giving clenched-fist salutes] Late last night [2 June] (Manochanov), a people's deputy of the Armenian Supreme Soviet, who is under investigation, returned to Yerevan from Moscow. As is known, he is accused, at one and the same time, under several articles of the criminal code, and before that he was held in custody. His first public appearance was on the steps of the plane. In actual fact is that he himself assesses his arrest as persecution for his political convictions and that after his return to Nagorno-Karabakh, he will not betray his previous ideals of a freedom fighter.

Raiders in Armenia Attempt To Seize Tanks

PM3005104090 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 May 90 First Edition p 3

[Dispatch by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Kaushanskiy from Yerevan under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Tank Hunters"]

[Text] Yerevan—There were just over 20 of them, these new T-72 tanks, due to be dispatched by rail from Masis station to one of the military units in the district. The first five tanks were already on a flatcar and the others had arrived at the loading station in a column. A commonplace event. But on this day it did not prove possible to dispatch the train. The path of the advancing column of combat vehicles was unexpectedly blocked by

an imposing crowd. Shouts were heard: "We know you're heading to help Azerbaijan, we won't let you!" Insults were hurled at the military. The situation was becoming heated, and, in order to defuse it and avoid clashes, the tank drivers took the only correct decision—to return to the depot.

Meanwhile, at Masis station, the fate of the five tanks that stood immobile on the flatcar was being decided. An armed group of militants suddenly appeared and thrust aside the guard, which was small in number. Some of the raiders, those with knowledge of the job, settled into the seats of the driver-mechanics. The tanks (all of which were unarmed) slid slowly from the flatcars and began their unforeseen procession.

"Restraint and sangfroid were required of the command, so as to prevent bloodshed," Major General K. Cherepanov, first deputy chief of the Transcaucasian Military District Political Directorate, commented on this dramatic story. "What is more, we had to withstand the militants' far from diplomatic verbal onslaught until—persuaded, as a result of negotiations, of the absolute absurdity of their enterprise—they voluntarily returned the tanks."

An incident, it would seem, with a happy ending. However, in the context of subsequent events, it does not inspire optimism. Two days after the episode described above, in the environs of Kirovakan, militants attacked republic internal security troops guarding railroad tunnels, and carried off five pistols. At 0100 hours on 21 May raiders stole a GAZ-66 vehicle belonging to Yerevan Polytechnic Institute military faculty, and at the same time seized a faulty radio transceiver.

And in the evening of the same day, another group of uninvited guests, brandishing weapons, burst by car onto the territory of a fuel and lubricants warehouse 25 km east of Leninakan. In the barracks, the bandits told Major A. Gerashchenko at gunpoint to order the guard to hand over weapons to them. This was followed by a categorical refusal and, almost simultaneously, the officer was shot. Fortunately the major survived and has been sent for treatment. Nevertheless the militants, seizing five submachine guns and five magazines for them, escaped.

And once again, for the umpteenth time, the republic law enforcement organs listen sympathetically to the military's complaints, expecting them to deal with the raiders even without the help of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], the KGB, and other entirely official organizations. A strange attitude, let us say frankly.

Relative Peace 'Disrupted' in NKAO

NC0406075790 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Corrspondent Kemal Orudzhev reports from Stepanakert that the relative peace in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] has been disrupted during the past two weeks. The republic's NKAO Organization Committee and the commandant of the state of emergency rayon have been instituting measures to normalize the economy and the life and activity of the people in the NKAO. As a result, about 2,200 passengers travel on 72 roads daily. More than 200 passengers fly to Baku, Yerevan, and Tbilisi on nine flights every day.

Meanwhile, 20 or 40 freight cars arrive in Stepanakert daily. Twenty-four freight cars were unloaded during the past day. The freight cars generally carry iron and concrete materials, wood products, various types of technical tools, etc. A freight car loaded with gravel and a freight car of electrical [word indistinct] have been dispatched from Stepanakert. The industrial plants, factories, and rural workers are resuming work.

However, the false national heroes and the bearded individuals are trying in every way to conceal the (?services) from the eyes of the people.

In accordance with a call made by the republic's NKAO Organization Committee, all of the people in Azerbaijan have rushed to extend aid to the NKAO. The party, soviet, and economic workers of the Baku districts visited the NKAO Organization Committee on 28 May to express their readiness to help. The commandant of the state of emergency rayon and the representatives of the people of Baku met to establish the areas in which work is to be carried out. Also, the party aktivs from Baku's Narmanov, Nasimi, [word indistinct], 26 Baku commissars, (?Khatayi), and Karadag districts and economic workers from a number of ministries were sent out to work on the same day.

A group of the [word indistinct] workers of the republic have [words indistinct] with the members of the press. They are trying to help the workers in NKAO's rayons and towns settle their daily concerns and seasonal problems.

Report on Azerbaijan Party Plenum Proceedings

NC0406080390 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] The Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee held a plenum on 2 June. The plenum discussed the following:

1. The report to be submitted to the 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress on the situation of reconstruction work and the tasks of the republic's party organizations.

2. Matters related to preparations for the 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress.

3. The outcome of the work carried out by the committee set up during the plenum held by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee in January 1990 to investigate the activities of Abdul-Rakhman Vezirov during the time he was first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee.

Ayaz Mutalibov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, briefed the plenum on the first item on the agenda. The plenum approved the Central Committee's report on the reconstruction work and the tasks of the republic's party organizations, which will be submitted to the 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress.

Viktor Polyanichko, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, briefed the plenum on preparations for the 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress. Akhundov, chairman of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Party Control Commission, briefed the plenum on the work carried out by the committee set up during the plenum held by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee in January 1990 to investigate the activities of Abdul-Rakhman Vezirov when he was first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee. Mustafayev, deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers; Ibragimov, director of the Azerbaijan branch of the Soviet Children's Fund named after Lenin; Murtazayev, member of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee; Khalilov, lecturer at the Azerbaijan Medical Institute named after Nariman Narimanov; USSR People's Deputy Gasanova, director of the [name indistinct] collective farm in Fizuli Rayon; USSR People's Deputy Ibragimov, popular writer; Mamedov, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR People's Control Committee; and Aliyev, member of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, addressed the debate that was held on the matter.

Abdul-Rakhman Vezirov deserves to be expelled from the CPSU for his (?activities). However, considering the complex situation in Azerbaijan created by the worsening of the ethnic relations in the region and the fact that Vezirov has sincerely admitted his (?mistakes), the plenum strongly reprimanded Vezirov in writing and stripped him of his membership with the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee.

Guseynov, responsible functionary of the CPSU Central Committee, participated in the work of the plenum.

'Georgian Citizens' League Mission Noted

PM2905102190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 May 90 First Edition p 3

["Direct Line" report by unidentified orrespondent: "They Will Have To Answer for It"]

[Text] Tbilisi—On the night of 14-15 May, 22 soldiers absconded from a unit in a remote garrison of the Transcaucasus Military District. A bus which was waiting for the fugitives outside the fence at the appointed hour took them to Dadiani Street in Tbilisi, to the premises of the organization called the "Georgian Citizens' League."

The league describes its mission as follows: moral support for those "who have given up USSR citizenship, taken independent Georgian citizenship, and decided to devote themselves to the national liberation movement."

The commander of the unit from which they absconded was sent a petition signed by A. Chitadze and M. Dzhorbenadze, members of the league's founding committee. When I read this document with its special letterhead, I wondered what its most obvious feature was—political naivety, legal ignorance, or bellicose youthful maximalism? The petition's authors inform the commander that the runaways are renouncing Soviet citizenship. Then there are arguments about the "occupation" of Georgia in 1921 and references to international documents, and, finally, the league states that "the individuals listed above were tricked into taking USSR citizenship. By renouncing Soviet citizenship, they become by right citizens of the state of Georgia."

When unit political worker Colonel A. Demyanov went to the league's headquarters they tried to have a "political talk" with him in that vein.

It must be said that a tone of brazen intimidation is becoming increasingly evident when the Georgian "liberators" talk with servicemen. The other day in Sukhumi, the Abkhazia military commissar was told that "more effective measures" would be taken unless he suspended the draft and refused to carry out the "will of the people."

I asked Major General of Justice V. Ivanov, Transcaucasus Military District military prosecutor, to comment on the situation:

"All I can say is that I pity these boys," he said. "They are all bound to be tried. The prosecutor's office at their garrison has instituted criminal proceedings against them. Those who are currently harboring the fugitives will have to answer for it too. And no one intends to ask the league or any other informal organization what the military justice organs should do. That is what the law is for."

Georgia's Political Situation Examined

90US0972B Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 23 May 90 p 1

[Article by N. Mikeladze: "Political Instability"]

[Text] "There are few places in the USSR where the passionate desire for independence is stronger than in Georgia..."—this is how the situation is evaluated by a FINANCIAL TIMES correspondent. And another visiting journalist says: "You could hardly find a single other region which, while expertly observing all the formalities of subordination to the Kremlin, is still advancing quietly to its appointed goal."

As for expert observance of formalities—this virtue belongs mainly to the "aktiv" of the staff of republic

communists. Proof of this is the main event of recent days: the Communist Party Congress.

Delegates to the congress, as we know, were discussing an unoriginal decision—to postpone further work until the 28th CPSU Congress. And this means they have postponed the "question of questions"—the status of the republic organization.

And so the event did not take place. And all this week the most sensational affairs took place not far away—in front of the building of the "small" Central Committee. It was being picketed by informals. Let me remind you: There were less than two weeks left before the deadline set by the republic Komsomol for self- determination. A new nonpolitical youth organization was being created in the Central Committee—it seemed that it would be possible to wait. Representatives of the "blockading side" explained that they would not intervene during the course of this process if it were not the last plenum of the Komsomol Central Committee devoted to the organizational issue. Since there would be a complete personnel reshuffle during the three or four weeks before self-determination—or, as we call it, self-elimination—the self- elimination would most likely not take place.

We are speaking about the plenum of the Central Committee of the Georgian Komsomol which relieved First Secretary Sesili Gogiberidze of her duties.

It elected as first secretary of the Central Committee Grigoriy (Gigla) Baramidze, who announced that a new organization had to be created, but that the people who created it would not really demand that the future members turn in their party cards, including Communist Party cards. The pickets were removed but rallies are held each evening in front of the Central Committee building. Incidentally, the rumors about taking over the building were exaggerated. The instigators of the action—four informal associations—have already had three work rooms in this building for some time.

Several days ago after the split in the national forum—the block of radical parties and societies that call themselves the irreconcilable opposition—the leaders of these sociopolitical organizations made another attempt to unite and arrive at a common position on the issues that are most important to Georgia. But on a broader and more open basis. A national congress was scheduled for 23-25 May. The purpose was the creation of a national compact. For the first time not only opposition organizations but also official ones were invited to participate in such measures—the full membership of the Supreme Soviet and the USSR people's deputies from Georgia and also representatives of the Academy of Sciences, VUZ's [higher educational institutions], and so forth. The event has not yet occurred but the very attempt of the "irreconcilables" to change their tactics is undoubtedly quite significant. It is quite possible that the prolonged period of stormy street democracy will assume constructive forms. Recent months make it possible to hope that such a thing will become a reality.

Georgian Union of Free Democrats Formed

90US0960A Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian 27 Apr 90 pp 4-5

["Georgian Union of Free Democrats Initiative Group Declaration"]

[Text] A new stage has arrived in the history of Georgia. The socio-political situation in Georgia has substantially changed as a result of the forceful actions of the people's liberation and democratic movement. It is becoming possible to conduct political activities using democratic methods after official recognition of the multi-party system.

Today it has become clear for all of us—both friends and foes: A free Georgia is the goal of the Georgian people. But for the time being we have not obtained a clear and substantiated recognition of what specific method we must use to achieve this goal. Sociopolitical consciousness is basically limited by the proclamation of the general idea of a future democratic and independent Georgia and attention to a lesser degree is being paid to those acute problems that are characteristic of the transition period.

Recently a great number of political and social organizations have been founded in Georgia. But despite this, we are far from a genuine multi-party system. We do not have parliamentary type mass parties and political activity is clearly inadequate as a result. A large portion of the people who are ready to direct their talent and energy on behalf of the common cause cannot find practical organizational forms to do this. It is necessary to establish an entirely new type of sociopolitical association whose functions will be substantially different from those we already have. They should not only exercise control over or exert pressure on the activities of existing state organs but should also present specific programs of action to the people, influence public opinion, obtain a mandate of the people's trust during the elections, and assume responsibility for implementing these programs. Georgia's entire intellectual potential and all of its energy should be directed toward resolving the urgent problems confronting the people.

Civilized society knows that the sole institute of participation in political activities is the political association. To not utilize this method today means to commit a very grave error. The time has come to mobilize all of the forces that organizationally unite those people who have common political views and world outlook principles.

The Georgian Union of Free Democrats is being founded for this purpose. We appeal for you to unite around the Union's Program which is based on the harmonic combination of the principles of freedom of the individual and will of the people—liberalism and democracy. This is not ideology in its widely accepted sense in our country and it does not foreordain the development of society within a strictly defined framework. The establishment of conditions for free social life

is the main objective of this ideological guideline. It views any forceful pressure on the natural flow of public life as an anomaly and a social outrage and will fight against it. Victory of genuinely national and progressive trends is only possible in a free society. Freedom of the individual and social responsibility go well together only in such a society.

The immediate and urgent task that confronts the Georgian people today is restoration of independent national statehood. This is a complex but entirely realistic objective that the Georgian people are capable of today.

Social life in a free Georgia must be based on the following basic principles:

—Man is born free and no one has the right to limit his freedom. Only the need to insure the freedom of others can limit freedom of the individual. Public and state life must be organized according to the common will of the people but the basic rights of the individual, freedom of speech and religion, the inviolability of property, housing, etc. must remain inviolable.

—Freedom of enterprise and initiative must be the basis of economic life under conditions of all types of property. State intervention in the economy must occur using economic methods and must consider the development of priority directions that result from national interests; and, we need to establish social guarantees for people with low income levels.

—Not only separate individuals but nations must be the subject of freedom. The principle of a national state does not contradict the rights of ethnic groups who reside on the territory of this State. All citizens of the Georgian State enjoy equal rights, regardless of origin, and any ethnic group may implement cultural autonomy if they are loyal to the interests of the State.

—The state together with all institutions is nothing other than the organ of expression and realization of social interests. The State serves society and not the reverse. The legislative, executive, and judicial organs are divided among themselves.

—The right to free functioning of social and political associations and also the mass media—is inviolable. Any monopoly in the sphere of politics, ideology, or culture—is intolerable.

This social system corresponds to our deepest national roots, and the moral, economic, and cultural traditions of the Georgian people. Respect for the dignity of the individual, deep patriotism, and the Christian ethic combined with ethical and religious tolerance, respect of private property—on these fundamental values that, beginning from the Middle Ages, constitute the foundation of Georgia's social life and upon which modern civil and legal activities must organically rely.

This is how progressive Georgian society lived in the 19th Century. The ideas of freedom of the individual and the nation, democracy, enlightenment, ethical and religious tolerance, establishment of an enduring moral basis of social life, social justice, respect for labor and economic initiative—constitute the ideological foundation of the modern people's liberation movement that Solomon Dodashvili, Ilya Chavchavadze, Vazha Pshavela, Niko Nikoladze, Archil Dzhordzhadze and an entire constellation of brilliant thinkers laid in their time. Adherence to this tradition—is the guarantee that the restored Georgian State will become a worthy member of the single family of the world's peoples.

The socio-political person of the future sovereign Georgia will be determined not after the restoration of independence but will be the result of those political methods that we use to attain the goal. If we depend on anti-democratic methods during the struggle for independence, we will inevitably obtain dictatorial rule in independent Georgia. The inviolable protection of moral standards and respect for other different opinions and outlooks must already be placed at the basis of our political actions. A man living in current reality must feel that his life represents that basic value that is the main object of concern of all society. We will be able to create an independent and democratic Georgia based on freedom of the individual and a sense of dignity alone.

We are ready to cooperate with all political forces that are struggling toward these goals.

The Initiative Group

We invite all those who share our declaration's basic provisions to join the initiative group. Our telephone numbers are: 31-54-21 and 93-20-88.

Central Asia

Turkmen Supreme Soviet Amends Constitution

PM3105150990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 May 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Correspondent Vladimir Kuleshov dispatch under "Direct Line" rubric: "Constitutional Amendments Introduced"]

[Text] Ashkhabad—The second session of the Turkmen Supreme Soviet has ended.

The session introduced amendments to the republic's Constitution. In particular, amendments and additions have been introduced to articles concerning the role and position of the Turkmen Communist Party in society. Thus, Article Six now says that the Turkmen Communist Party and the trade union, youth, and other public organizations participate in the elaboration of USSR and Turkmen SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] state policy and in the administration of state and public affairs through their representatives elected to the Soviets of People's Deputies.

Debates Party Role, Presidency

LD2605045290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 25 May 90

[Text] The second session the Turkmen Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] ended today. The deputies discussed and adopted the Supreme Soviet rules and laws on the status of Turkmen SSR people's deputies, language, and constitutional supervision, and considered the question of urgent measures for developing processing branches of the agro-industrial complex.

Among the more important questions included in the agenda of the session was that of draft laws on inserting amendments and addenda into the republic's Constitution. In particular, changes and additions were made to articles of the basic law on the place and role in society of the Turkmenistan Communist Party. The deputies voted for the nominating of heads of ministries and departments by the Supreme Soviet of the republic to be conducted on a contested basis, and also for giving the republican parliament priority in nominating candidates to posts subordinate to the union, such as the procurator, military commissar, and a number of others.

Intense arguments arose at the session in connection with introducing the post of president of the republic. After a long discussion, the decision was adopted not to introduce the presidential form of government, at the same time considerably broadening the power of the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet chairman.

Tajik Issues Decree on Food, Consumer Goods

LD3106203390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] The Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers has adopted a decision that limits the taking of a number of consumer goods and agricultural produce beyond the bounds of the republic. As of tomorrow it is forbidden to take out all types of food, electrical goods, furniture and other goods in high demand. Well that's how we're moving to a market economy.

Kazakh Central Committee Plenum Reported

PM3105123790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 May 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent G. Dildyayev under the general heading: "Plenums Held"]

[Text] Alma-Ata, 29 May—A Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee plenum was held here. It approved the Central Committee accountability report to the 17th Kazakh Communist Party Congress, which begins 7 June. The report was delivered by N.A. Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee and president of the republic.

Another question was discussed. In view of the fact that the CPSU Central Committee Politburo has revised its appraisal of the resolution "On the Kazakh Republican Party Organization's Work on Working People's International and Patriotic Education," adopted following the December (1988) events in Alma-Ata, and in so doing has dropped the charges of "Kazakh nationalism" contained in it, the plenum has ceased monitoring the corresponding Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee resolution. The restoration of justice, it was noted at the plenum, does not relieve the peoples of the multinational republic of the obligation to do everything in their power to further strengthen perestroyka processes, friendship, and genuine internationalism.

Election Officials Found Guilty of Forgery

LD0406061590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0500 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] The trial of the case of (Zhanisov) and (Saganovich); members of a constituency electoral commission, has come to an end in Karaganda Oblast. They forged electoral documents at the elections for people's deputies to rayon soviets. The court investigation fully proved they were guilty of violating the law on elections to local soviets. The sentence was read out: two years corrective labor for each of them. A good lesson to all those who ignore the law in their professional zeal.

Committee on Germans Hears Kazakh Report

LD0106160890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1330 GMT 31 May 90

[Text] Moscow, 31 May (TASS)—This year, in localities densely populated by Soviet Germans, national schools will be opened and groups of students will be formed for instruction in their native tongue at higher education establishments. A decision on this was adopted at a sitting of the State Committee on the Problems of the Soviet Germans, headed by Vladimir Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, which took place here today.

A report by the government of Kazakhstan on work on the resolution of the problems of almost a million individuals of German nationality who are living in this republic, was heard. It was noted that they occupy a prominent position in the social and political life of the republic. More than 400 of them hold leading posts in party and local soviet bodies. Five individuals are USSR people's deputies and 10 are deputies of the republic's parliament. Every 10th kolkhoz [collective farm] in the republic is headed by a German.

A newspaper is published in German in Kazakhstan and radio and television broadcasts are organized. A German dramatic theater and a cultural center are functioning in the republic's capital.

The commission also adopted a decision on setting up rayon, rural and village soviets in localities in Kazakhstan densely populated by Germans.

Kazakh Social Democrats Discuss Platform

LD2805225590 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1400 GMT 28 May 90

[Text] A conference of the Kazakhstan Social Democratic Party [KSDP] has been held in Alma-Ata. About 100 delegates from seven oblasts took part, although they expected more people from all regions of the republic. The KSDP intends to cooperate with other democratic movements to promote radical economic and social reforms within the framework of the republican Constitution, and to display solidarity with all progressive social forces, to allow to exist within its own ranks factions within the general program. The new party is against national exclusiveness and hostility to other peoples. It advocates market relations as the basic regulator of economic life, and equality of all forms of ownership. The delegates worked out an action platform, adopted the rules, and elected the leading organs [words indistinct] As is known, according to the law, every new party must be registered. This must also be done by KSDP.

Report on Debates at Karaganda Miners Meeting

PM2905133190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 May 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Dispatch by Oleg Stefashin: "Karaganda Miners' Conference"]

[Text] Karaganda miners have held a conference at the initiative of the oblast strike committee.

It must be noted that the situation in the Karaganda coalfield has remained quite complex recently. Conflicts are flaring up first at one mine, then at another. What is the reason for this instability? The conference provided the answer to this question.

According to the speakers, the demands put forward by the miners are not being satisfactorily met. Of the 47 points in the so-called protocol of agreed measures, only 17 have been fulfilled. This is causing dissatisfaction in the labor collectives, and they are increasingly asking themselves the question: What should be done next, how should attention be brought to their unresolved problems?

A sharp debate on this subject unfolded at the conference. The hotheads argued in favor of holding another strike. This proposal was put to the vote but was not supported. Good sense prevailed. But for how long? Representatives of the moderate wing of the workers movement had a majority of only one vote in defending their position. Dissatisfied with this outcome, some of the delegations left the hall.

The decision on forming a "Union of Karaganda Oblast Working People" holds a special place among the resolutions adopted at the conference. Its aim, so its statutes say, is "to strive for consolidation and mutual assistance in the work of citizens and organizations to defend the rights, freedoms, and interests of working people and for the transformation of society on the basis of the principles of democracy, humanism, and social justice." A constituent conference of the new workers movement, which will be open to all parties, sociopolitical organizations, labor collectives, and individual citizens, is planned for June or thereabouts.

Karaganda Miners Welcome New Trade Union Role

PM3005102390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 26 May 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: G. Sytykh,, M. Gabdullina reportage on Karaganda coal mine trade union committee's work]

[Text] [Announcer] You must admit that our trade unions and their role in the production sphere are changing for the better—slowly, it is true, but they are changing. Those who until very recently eagerly waited for instructions from the management and party committees are being replaced by new people. The latter care sincerely about the working people's interests. So in Karaganda, too, representatives of the miners' movement have taken over the leadership of the trade unions.

[G. Sytykh] The miners' workers committee, or strike committee as it was originally known, is probably the organization which carries most weight among workers in Karaganda. [video shows committee room, officials at work, debating, telephoning] Workers, and not just miners, come here with all their troubles. Their logic is simple: These are our people, they will understand and help. However, the committee as a social organization does not have much power, and, increasingly, the activists of the workers movement are operating through their representatives in official organs. So, for example, worker Murat Ramazanov [camera homes in on Ramazanov] has been elected deputy chairman of the oblast trade union council. His colleague heads the territorial committee of the Coal Industry Workers Union. Other members of the workers committee have become deputies in soviets of various levels. And the trade union has started acting as an independent organization operating in the interests of the working people.

At present, for instance, an agreement is in preparation between the oblast trade union council and the oblast soviet of people's deputies under which the trade union assumes firm control of all social, cultural, and consumer issues [video shows copy of agreement]

[V. Perebeynos, cochairman of workers committee] You see, when we came into being as an organization in July of last year when we applied the ultimate sanction, what we wanted to achieve and what we set as one of our main objectives was to force the official power structures in existence today to do their work properly, that is, to protect our interests rather than defend their own interests against the working people and against us. We wanted them to attend to their proper functions.

[P. Shumkin, cochairman of workers committee] The workers committee already has something it can fall back on: It has a copying machine, it has funds which it can use, which means that its work has become easier, and the first victories have been won both in the territorial committee and the oblast trade union council, of which they are they are probably aware to some extent. However, it would be too soon to say that the trade unions (are fully behind us?)

[Sytykh] Nonetheless, things have started moving. [video shows miners debating in front of entrance to mine named for "60-letiye Oktyabrskoy Revolyutsii"] New trade union committees have been elected at mines. New Coal Industry Workers Union Statutes have come into force which state that the trade unions are not dependent on any political, state, or other formation but operate on a par with them. The Statutes are based on a draft compiled by Karaganda miners. People are meeting with more and more understanding in their trade union committees.

[V. Matveyev, a drift worker from aforementioned mine] Before the trade union committee was like a riddle: We did know for what purpose money was being allocated or to whom it was being allocated. Now we have elected our own people. When you come to the committee, you can feel that people want to help, you can feel that you have come to your own organ.

[Sytykh] You mean, people have confidence in the trade union committee.

[V. Matveyev] Yes, there is confidence.

Lichtenstein Firm Opens Mission in Alma-Ata

LD1705160890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0913 GMT 17 May 90

[Text] Alma-Ata, 17 May (TASS)—The official presentation of the first mission of a foreign firm took place today in Alma-Ata. The "United Companies" trust from Lichtenstein opened its office in Kazakhstan.

"'United Companies', being a consultative-legal trust, proposed a number of mutually-beneficial projects to the government of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]," Antonio Corbi director of the trust, told a TASS correspondent. "They envisage cooperation in the textile industry, the construction in the town of Pavlodar of a metallurgical works for the production of aluminium, and also the creation of joint enterprises in the food industry."

Name Change for Alma-Ata Square Reported

LD3005084990 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 0100 GMT 29 May 90

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic has resolved:

Taking into consideration the wish of the population of Alma-Ata city, to agree with the proposal of the executive committee of the Alma-Ata City Soviet of People's Deputies on changing the name of the New Square in the city of Alma-Ata; from now it should be called Republic Square, where only official events should be staged.